

Also, a bill (H. R. 10294) to authorize the construction of a Federal office building in Berkeley, Calif., for the use of Federal agencies maintaining offices on the campus of the University of California, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. GREEN: A bill (H. R. 10295) authorizing the Secretary of the Navy to construct and maintain a Government radio-broadcasting station; authorizing the United States Commissioner of Education to provide programs of national and international interest; making necessary appropriations for the construction, maintenance, and operation of the station and production of programs therefor, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. HEALEY: A bill (H. R. 10296) to amend an act entitled "An act relating to the liability of common carriers by railroad to their employees in certain cases," approved April 22, 1908, as amended (U. S. C., title 45, ch. 2); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LUCKEY of Nebraska: A bill (H. R. 10297) to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Missouri River at or near Rulo, Nebr.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MANSFIELD: A bill (H. R. 10298) authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. SCOTT: Resolution (H. Res. 465) requesting the President of the United States to submit certain data relative to treaties between nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BURDICK: A bill (H. R. 10299) for the relief of John K. Kennelly; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. COLE of New York: A bill (H. R. 10300) granting a pension to Forrest E. Andrews; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. LUCKEY of Nebraska: A bill (H. R. 10301) for the relief of Ladislav Knizek; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. McCLELLAN: A bill (H. R. 10302) for the relief of Mrs. J. R. Bennett; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. O'CONNOR of New York: A bill (H. R. 10303) for the relief of Reynold F. Migdalski; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. PATRICK: A bill (H. R. 10304) granting a pension to Clifffe Frederick; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RANDOLPH: A bill (H. R. 10305) to authorize appointment of Robert T. Eilertson as warrant officer, United States Army; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

4838. By Mr. CURLEY: Petition of the American Legion, New York County organization, New York City, urging the retention of all post exchanges at the Army posts and the establishment of post exchanges at Army encampments, bases, forts, and reservations; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

4839. By Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON: Petition of J. Webb Howell, Bryan, Tex., opposing the wage-and-hour bill; to the Committee on Rules.

4840. By Mr. KENNEDY of New York: Petition of the American Legion, concerning the retention of all post exchanges without restrictions to be established in Army encampments, bases, forts, and reservations so that enlisted men and officers will receive its benefits; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

4841. Also, petition of citizens of Buffalo, N. Y., stating that permanent improvement requires the sincere cooperation

of Government with business and industry (including capital, labor, and management) and requesting the Federal Government to evidence an acceptance of its share of this joint responsibility by discouraging propaganda which inflames emotions and breeds dissension among the various sections of the population, and by removing obstacles which have prevented business from planning ahead and have made investors afraid to supply the capital needed by industry; to the Committee on Labor.

4842. By Mr. KEOGH: Petition of the New York Board of Trade, Inc., New York City, opposing the passage of House bill 3134, imposing a 1 cent per gallon tax on fuel oil; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

4843. Also, petition of the New York Board of Trade, New York City, concerning Senate bill 3390, to extend the power of the National Labor Relations Board; to the Committee on Labor.

4844. Also, petition of the American Legion, New York County organization, New York City, N. Y., advocating the retention of all post exchanges without restriction; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

4845. Also, petition of the Window Advertising, Inc., New York City, concerning title 9 of the pending revenue act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

4846. By Mr. MEAD: Petition of the Erie County Industrial Union Council, urging expansion and continuation of Works Progress Administration activities; to the Committee on Appropriations.

4847. By Mr. MERRITT: Resolution of the Maritime Exchange at the city of New York, stating that the executive committee of the Brooklyn-Battery tunnel committee of the Maritime Exchange earnestly urge city, State, and Federal officials to coordinate their efforts in supporting the application to be filed by the New York City Tunnel Authority for necessary funds for early construction of the Brooklyn-Battery tunnel; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

4848. Also, resolution of the New York County organization of the American Legion, requesting that post exchanges be established in Army encampments, bases, forts, and reservations so that enlisted men and officers receive its benefits; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

4849. By Mr. WELCH: Joint Resolution No. 5 of the California Senate relative to memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to enact House bill 9256, relative to reimbursement by the Federal Government to States and counties for expenditures in behalf of nonresidents, and to make available Federal funds for flood relief; Joint Resolution No. 6, relative to Federal tax on oil; Resolution No. 7, relative to memorializing the President and Congress to provide all necessary aids to night air navigation; also, Joint Resolution No. 15, relative to aliens in America; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

4850. By Mr. FITZPATRICK: Petition signed by a number of citizens of the Williamsbridge section of the Bronx, New York City, N. Y., urging the passage of the 30-year retirement bill, necessitating compulsory retirement of post-office clerks and carriers after 30 years' service, and House bill 9924, requiring that all post-office substitutes after 1 year's service be appointed regulars; also Congressman Celler's bill, House Joint Resolution 346; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

SENATE

TUESDAY, APRIL 19, 1938

(Legislative day of Wednesday, January 5, 1938)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BARKLEY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Friday, April 15, 1938, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF BILLS

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Latta, one of his secretaries, who also announced that the President had approved and signed the following acts:

On April 15, 1938:

- S. 112. An act for the relief of O. W. Waddle;
- S. 284. An act for the relief of Clear Creek Mountain Springs, Inc.;
- S. 1660. An act for the relief of Essie E. Leatherwood;
- S. 2022. An act for the relief of Lt. V. Balletto and others;
- S. 2091. An act for the relief of Ada Saul, Steve Dolack, the estate of Anthony Dolack, and Marie McDonald;
- S. 2138. An act for the relief of Nelson W. Apple, George Marsh, and Camille Carmignani;
- S. 2378. An act for the relief of Sam Green;
- S. 3130. An act for the relief of W. O. West; and
- S. 3464. An act to extend the Metlakatla Indians' Citizenship Act.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Chaffee, one of its reading clerks, communicated to the Senate the intelligence of the death of Hon. CHARLES J. GOLDEN, late a Representative from the State of California, and transmitted the resolutions of the House thereon.

The message announced that the House had passed without amendment the following bills of the Senate:

- S. 1279. An act to authorize the sale, under the provisions of the act of March 12, 1926 (44 Stat. 203), of surplus War Department real property;
- S. 2531. An act to authorize the transfer of certain military reservations to other agencies of the Government and to the people of Puerto Rico, and for other purposes;
- S. 3160. An act to provide for the exchange of land in the Territory of Alaska;
- S. 3272. An act to clarify the status of pay and allowances under the provisions of the act of September 3, 1919; and
- S. 3530. An act to amend the National Defense Act of June 3, 1916, as amended, by reestablishing the Regular Army Reserve, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 3590) to amend an act entitled "An act for making further and more effectual provision for the national defense, and for other purposes," approved June 3, 1916, as amended by the act of June 4, 1920, so as to make available certain other officers for General Staff duty, with amendments, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message further announced that the House had passed the following bills and joint resolution, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

- H. R. 6243. An act to authorize a survey of the old Indian trail and the highway known as "Oglethorpe Trail" with a view of constructing a national roadway on this route to be known as the "Oglethorpe National Trail and Parkway";
- H. R. 7880. An act to amend the Veterans' Regulation No. 10, pertaining to "line of duty" for peacetime veterans, their widows and dependents, and for other purposes;
- H. R. 8008. An act to provide for the purchase of public lands for home and other sites;
- H. R. 8936. An act authorizing a per capita payment of \$15 each to the members of the Red Lake Band of Chippewa Indians from the proceeds of the sale of timber and lumber on the Red Lake Reservation;
- H. R. 9601. An act to amend the acts for promoting the circulation of reading matter among the blind;
- H. R. 9721. An act authorizing the disbursement of funds appropriated for compensation of help for care of material, animals, armament, and equipment in the hands of the National Guard of the several States, Territories, and the District of Columbia, and for other purposes;
- H. R. 10085. An act to authorize the payment of an indemnity to the Norwegian Government in full and final satisfaction of all claims based on the detention and treat-

ment of the crew of the Norwegian steamer *Sagatind* subsequent to the seizure of this vessel by the U. S. Coast Guard cutter *Seneca* on October 12, 1924; and

H. J. Res. 622. Joint Resolution authorizing the President of the United States of America to proclaim October 11, 1938, General Pulaski's Memorial Day for the observance and commemoration of the death of Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled bill (S. 3400) to extend from June 16, 1938, to June 16, 1939, the period within which loans made prior to June 16, 1933, to executive officers of member banks of the Federal Reserve System may be renewed or extended, and it was signed by the Vice President.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. LEWIS. I note the absence of a quorum, and ask that the roll be called in order to secure one.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Adams	Dieterich	Lee	Radcliffe
Andrews	Donahay	Lewis	Reames
Ashurst	Duffy	Lodge	Reynolds
Austin	Ellender	Logan	Russell
Bailey	Frazier	Loneragan	Schwartz
Bankhead	George	Lundeen	Schwellenbach
Barkley	Gerry	McAdoo	Sheppard
Berry	Gillette	McCarran	Shipstead
Bilbo	Glass	McGill	Smathers
Bone	Green	McKellar	Smith
Borah	Hale	McNary	Thomas, Utah
Bridges	Harrison	Maloney	Townsend
Brown, Mich.	Hatch	Miller	Truman
Brown, N. H.	Hayden	Milton	Tydings
Bulkeley	Herring	Minton	Vandenberg
Bulow	Hill	Murray	Van Nuys
Byrd	Hitchcock	Neely	Wagner
Byrnes	Holt	Norris	Walsh
Capper	Hughes	Nye	Wheeler
Caraway	Johnson, Calif.	O'Mahoney	White
Chavez	Johnson, Colo.	Overton	
Connally	King	Pittman	
Copeland	La Follette	Pope	

Mr. LEWIS. I announce that the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BURKE], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. CLARK], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. GUFFEY], the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER], and the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS] are detained from the Senate on important public business. I ask that this announcement stand of record for the day.

Mr. AUSTIN. I announce that my colleague the junior Senator from Vermont [Mr. GIBSON] and the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DAVIS] are necessarily absent from the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Eighty-nine Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

INTERNATIONAL UNION OF GEODESY AND GEOPHYSICS

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, as follows:

To the Congress of the United States of America:

I commend to the favorable consideration of the Congress the enclosed report from the Secretary of State to the end that legislation may be enacted authorizing and requesting the President of the United States to invite the International Union of Geodesy and Geophysics to hold its Seventh General Assembly in the United States during the calendar year 1939, and to invite foreign governments to participate in that general assembly; and authorizing an appropriation of \$5,000 to assist in meeting the expenses necessary for participation by the United States in the meeting.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, April 19, 1938.

EXPENSES OF PARTICIPATION IN THIRD PAN AMERICAN HIGHWAY CONFERENCE

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States, which was read,

and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

To the Congress of the United States:

I commend to the favorable consideration of the Congress the enclosed report from the Secretary of State, to the end that legislation may be enacted authorizing an appropriation of the sum of \$15,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, for the expenses of participation by the United States in the Third Pan American Highway Conference, to be held at Santiago, Chile, in September 1938.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, April 19, 1938.

PROPOSED TRANSFER OF MOREHEAD CITY (N. C.) TARGET RANGE

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the transfer to the jurisdiction of the Secretary of the Treasury of portions of the property within the military reservation known as the Morehead City (N. C.) Target Range, for the construction of improvements thereon, and for other purposes, which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

AMENDMENT OF ALASKA RAILROAD RETIREMENT ACT

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend sections 6 and 7 of the act entitled "An act for the retirement of employees of the Alaska Railroad, Territory of Alaska, who are citizens of the United States," approved June 29, 1936, which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Civil Service.

DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate letters from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, lists of papers and documents on the files of the Departments of the Treasury, Interior, and Post Office, and the Works Progress Administration, which are not needed in the conduct of business and have no permanent value or historical interest, and requesting action looking to their disposition, which, with the accompanying papers, were referred to a Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Papers in the Executive Departments.

The VICE PRESIDENT appointed Mr. BARKLEY and Mr. GIBSON members of the committee on the part of the Senate.

SPECIAL JOINT COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a letter, which was read, as follows:

UNITED STATES SENATE,
Washington, D. C., April 7, 1938.

Hon. JOHN N. GARNER,

Vice President, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I regret very much that I feel compelled to ask to be relieved from membership on the special joint congressional committee to make an investigation of the Tennessee Valley Authority.

Respectfully yours,

ARTHUR CAPPER.

The VICE PRESIDENT appointed Mr. DAVIS to fill the vacancy caused by the resignation of Mr. CAPPER.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following joint resolutions of the Legislature of the State of California, which were referred to the Committee on Commerce:

Assembly joint resolution relative to memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to make available Federal funds for flood relief

Whereas in the wake of a succession of recent unprecedented storms and floods which have resulted in a deplorable loss of life and destruction of property, the State of California faces relief and reconstruction problems reaching the proportions of a major disaster; and

Whereas the total public and private losses sustained will exceed \$52,000,000, according to conservative estimates prepared by State engineers and by representatives of various counties and cities; and

Whereas every resource of its citizenry and of its State, county, and municipal governments is being employed to relieve suffering and to effect essential restoration of its highways, bridges, streets, and flood-control works; and

Whereas California moneys available for flood relief and for highway and flood-control repair and maintenance, together with supplementary funds potentially available for such purposes, is not expected to exceed \$11,000,000; and

Whereas such moneys will be totally inadequate to meet all the expenditures necessitated by the present emergency: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Assembly and Senate of the State of California, jointly, That the State of California through its legislature hereby respectfully requests the President and the Congress of the United States that Federal funds be made available for expenditure in the State of California for flood relief and for the repair and reconstruction of damaged highways, streets, and flood-control works, under the supervision of any Federal agency that might be designated; and be it further

Resolved, That a portion of such moneys be allocated for the support of the coordinated Federal and State program of farm debt adjustment to whose personnel has been entrusted certain details of distress relief in the rural areas; and be it further

Resolved, That the Governor is requested to transmit copies of this resolution to the President and to the Vice President of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to the Senators and Representatives of the State of California in Congress.

Senate joint resolution relative to memorializing the President and Congress to provide all necessary aids to night air navigation

Whereas the Transcontinental & Western Air, Inc., an air line, has been granted permission to operate and maintain passenger, mail, and express schedules between San Francisco, Calif., and Winslow, Ariz., by way of Fresno, Calif., and Las Vegas, Nev.; and Whereas the present established airway between San Francisco, Calif., and Winslow, Ariz., via Fresno, Calif., and Las Vegas, Nev., is not completely lighted for night flying; and

Whereas a completely lighted airway for night flying between San Francisco, Calif., and Winslow, Ariz., or Kingman, Ariz., would relieve the necessity of using portions of the present coast airway for night or instrument flying, which is indirect; and

Whereas a most unfortunate plane disappearance occurred on this airway which experienced aviators attribute to the lack of adequate signal facilities, which disappearance has probably resulted in the loss of lives of a number of persons: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and the Assembly of the State of California, jointly, That the Legislature of the State of California respectfully urges and memorializes the President and the Congress of the United States of America to take such steps as are proper to remedy the present situation and to speedily cause to be installed all the necessary aids to air navigation as to permit regular night scheduled air-line operation direct between San Francisco, Calif., and Winslow, Ariz., or Kingman, Ariz. (whichever would prove to be more suitable), by way of Fresno, Calif., and Las Vegas, Nev.; and be it further

Resolved, That the Governor of the State of California is hereby requested to transmit copies of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to each Senator and Member of the House of Representatives from California in the Congress of the United States; and that such Senators and Representatives from California are hereby respectfully urged to support any necessary or appropriate measures for legislation to accomplish the purposes set forth in this resolution.

The VICE PRESIDENT also laid before the Senate the following joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of California, which was referred to the Committee on Finance:

Senate joint resolution relative to memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to enact H. R. 9256, relative to reimbursement by the Federal Government to States and counties for expenditures in behalf of nonresidents

Whereas the problem of relief for indigent nonresidents of the State of California has reached alarming proportions; and

Whereas there has been introduced in the Congress H. R. 9256, by Congressman VOORHIS providing for aid by the Federal Government to States which can and will meet the requirements of said act; and

Whereas said bill provides for the return of unemployable indigent transients to the State of their legal settlement at Federal expense, and gives the Social Security Board power to determine the State of legal settlement; and

Whereas said bill provides for Federal reimbursement to States and counties of moneys spent for relief and medical care of nonresidents; and

Whereas the provisions of said bill require that eligibility for relief thereunder is contingent upon registration for work with the United States Employment Service or an affiliated State employment service; and

Whereas, while no State is required to come under the terms of the bill, the provisions thereof are peculiarly applicable to the State of California, because of the fact that this State, by reason of its higher relief standards, has encouraged the migration of indigents into this State; and

Whereas the enactment of this bill would be of peculiar benefit to the State of California: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and Assembly of the State of California, jointly, That the President and the Congress of the United States are hereby memorialized and requested to enact said H. R. 9256; and be it further

Resolved, That the Governor transmit copies of this resolution to the President of the United States, the Vice President, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to the members of the delegation from California in the Congress.

The VICE PRESIDENT also laid before the Senate the following joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of California, which was referred to the Committee on Immigration:

Assembly joint resolution relative to aliens in America

Whereas the presence of the alien in this country and his activities constitute a grave problem that demands the immediate attention of Congress; and

Whereas this alien question directly affects every American wage earner, employer, and taxpayer, and forms the basis for much of the current distress, expense, and danger resulting from unemployment, relief, crime, and the activities of subversive minority groups; and

Whereas we know little about the aliens who are in this country, legally or otherwise, but we do know, however, according to reputable estimates, that there are three and a half million aliens unlawfully in this country, and the same sources indicate that there are from one million to one and a half million aliens on public relief. Others have estimated that one out of eight persons now on relief is an alien, while another set of reliable figures shows that there are 6,000,000 aliens enjoying regular employment in this country; and

Whereas California is not spared the disturbing effect of the alien, the 1930 census showing that there were in this State 256,147 unnaturalized aliens; and

Whereas it is safe to estimate that with the great influx of population from all over the country during the past 4 years, this California total has been swollen to formidable proportions; and

Whereas these estimates of the alien population of the United States cannot be taken lightly, and every American wage earner who has been replaced by foreign workers who refuse to swear allegiance of our country, every taxpayer who supports aliens on the relief rolls, and every citizen whose peace and security have been jeopardized by alien gangsters, criminals, kidnapers, drug peddlers, and mental defectives will testify to the gravity of the situation; and

Whereas this trouble will not end here, for on the day we started our vast social welfare program each alien within our borders became a distinct liability, as our relief agencies make no distinction between American citizens and aliens in administering relief, and the Social Security Act makes no distinction in the application of its terms between American citizens and aliens; and these factors, unless relieved by legislation, must necessarily result each year in an increasing burden for the taxpayer; and

Whereas a great percentage of the alien population, as long as it remains in this country, will continue to compete with the American workman for jobs, and the alien is not only to be found enjoying employment in private industry but, strange enough, is to be found on the pay rolls of the Government; and

Whereas in addition to the millions of aliens who are in this country illegally there are hundreds of thousands of others who have entered legally but have since abused the privileges of residence, many having engaged in violent crimes and having been convicted by courts, and in California alone one-eighth of the population of Folsom and San Quentin prisons is composed of alien felons; and

Whereas a vast number of alien agitators in this country have committed no offenses of the types outlined in our present deportation laws but still have been able to incite others to the widespread commission of acts hostile to the security of communities and States in which they live, and many of the activities of these alien agitators are known to have been financed by foreign agencies, for the sole purpose of undermining and destroying the American form of government and American institutions; and

Whereas nowhere in the world today does a similar situation exist where citizens of a country are forced to suffer in order to provide plenty for aliens, the major countries of Europe having laws which give preference of employment to the citizens of their country, and the American workman, however skilled, cannot secure employment in those countries if there is a citizen of that country who desires and can do the work; and

Whereas American citizens are not accepted and cared for on relief in foreign countries, being promptly sent home, while ours is the only country on earth that gives aliens the same opportunity for work and the same relief as American citizens, and no other country tolerates the situation that exists in the United States today; and

Whereas the answer to the alien problem is control; control at the gates of the country by smaller and more selective quotas; control of alien movements and activities within our borders by strict registration; control of alien conduct by mandatory deportation laws that will effect the immediate and certain deportation of those who violate the laws or the hospitality of our country; and

Whereas the present laws regulating aliens and deportation of aliens have proven inadequate, particularly in the so-called "hardship" cases, which have proven to be difficult of decision under existing regulations, but which can best be cared for by regulations written by Congress itself; and

Whereas California, with a heavy relief burden on its hands, confronted by a serious unemployment problem, already a victim of the alien criminal, gangster, dope peddler, is weary of the trials and distractions of the alien agitator: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Assembly and Senate of the State of California, jointly, That the Legislature of the State of California most respectfully urges and petitions the President and the Congress of the United States to enact legislation providing for three steps to deal with the alien problem: First, drastic reduction in now-existing quotas and the establishment of quotas for the countries of North and South America; second, registration of all aliens in the United States; and third, deportation of all aliens unlawfully in the United States, and the deportation of undesirable aliens, including dope peddlers, gangsters, racketeers, and criminals, the definitions and directions to be specific, leaving but a minimum of discretionary power to any administrative official; and be it further

Resolved, That the Governor of the State of California is hereby requested to transmit copies of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States, to the Speaker of the House, and to the Senators and Representatives of the State of California in Congress.

The VICE PRESIDENT also laid before the Senate the following joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of California, which was ordered to lie on the table:

Assembly joint resolution relative to Federal tax on oil

Whereas there has been introduced in the Congress of the United States House of Representatives bill No. 3134, which would impose an excise tax of 1 cent per gallon on fuel oil used to generate heat or power; and

Whereas there is produced in the State of California over 200,000,000 barrels of crude oil annually, a great portion of which is fuel oil which may be used to generate heat and power; and

Whereas the industry which produces this crude oil contributes great benefits to the State by creating a new wealth and provides work for many thousands of individuals; and

Whereas other industries in the State of California such as railroads, steamship lines, manufacturing plants, and agricultural pursuits all utilize vast amounts of fuel oil to generate heat and power, and the imposition of this tax would add greatly to their cost of doing business to the disadvantage of these industries compared with industries in other States using other sources of fuel: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Assembly and Senate of the State of California, jointly, That the President and the Congress of the United States are respectfully urged not to enact such legislation; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be transmitted by the Governor of the State of California to the President and Vice President of the United States, to the Speaker of the House, and to the Senators and Representatives of the State of California in Congress.

The VICE PRESIDENT also laid before the Senate resolutions of the General Court of Massachusetts, protesting against the inclusion of furniture and toys in any reciprocal-trade agreement made with foreign governments, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

(See resolution printed in full when presented today by Mr. WALSH.)

The VICE PRESIDENT also laid before the Senate a resolution adopted by the Regular Democratic Club of Valley Cottage, N. Y., protesting against opposition in Congress and by various financial interests to the general policies of the President of the United States, which was ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. WALSH presented the following resolutions of the General Court of Massachusetts, which were referred to the Committee on Finance:

THE COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Boston.

Resolutions memorializing the Federal Department of State in opposition to the inclusion of furniture and toys in any reciprocal-trade agreements made with foreign countries

Whereas the furniture industry and the toy industry furnish employment and livelihood for thousands of citizens in the Commonwealth, particularly in the city of Gardner and vicinity and in the town of Winchendon and vicinity; and

Whereas said industries are already suffering from the competition of imported furniture and imported toys under tariff rates which are insufficient to measure the cost of production abroad and the cost of production in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts; and

Whereas the wages of employees engaged in the foreign production of furniture and toys are substantially less than those paid in our domestic industry; and

Whereas the importation of furniture and toys into this country under a reduced rate of duty can have only one of two results, namely, a reduction in wages of the employees engaged in the pro-

duction of furniture and toys in the Commonwealth or a closing and liquidation of the industries in the Commonwealth which are engaged in the production of furniture and toys, thus causing a total loss of employment for our citizens employed in said industries and greatly adding to the number of the unemployed; and

Whereas the loss of said industries would seriously affect the tax revenues of cities and towns of the Commonwealth and seriously affect the economic status of all the residents thereof; and

Whereas the Federal Department of State has announced that it is contemplating negotiations of reciprocal-trade agreements with the British Empire and with Czechoslovakia contemplating a reduction in the present tariff upon furniture and certain toys: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the negotiations of such reciprocal-trade agreements, if the same include furniture and toys, is strongly opposed by the people of this Commonwealth, as represented by the general court thereof, and said general court urgently requests said Department of State to eliminate furniture and toys from further consideration in such trade agreements; and be it further

Resolved, That the secretary of the Commonwealth forward copies of these resolutions to the President of the United States, the Secretary of State of the United States, the presiding officers of both branches of Congress, and each Member of Congress from this Commonwealth.

In house of representatives, adopted April 5, 1938.

In senate, adopted, in concurrence, April 11, 1938.

A true copy. Attest:

[SEAL]

F. W. COOK,

Secretary of the Commonwealth.

Mr. LODGE presented resolutions of the General Court of Massachusetts, protesting against the inclusion of furniture and toys in any reciprocal-trade agreements made with foreign governments, which were referred to the Committee on Finance.

(See resolutions printed in full when presented today by Mr. WALSH.)

Mr. COPELAND presented the memorial of Mary Robinson, corresponding secretary, and sundry other members of Tau Alpha Chapter of Mu Phi Epsilon, National Honor Music Sorority, of New York City, N. Y., remonstrating against the enactment of the bill (S. 3296) to provide for a permanent Bureau of Fine Arts, which was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

He also presented a resolution adopted by the third district of the United States Naval Reserve Officers' Association, of New York City, N. Y., favoring an amendment to House bill 8790, to provide for civilian naval training, so as to permit the personnel of the Naval and Marine Corps Reserves being used for the same purposes as well as the personnel of the Regular Naval Establishment, which was referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

He also presented a resolution adopted by the third district of the United States Naval Reserve Officers' Association, of New York City, N. Y., favoring the enactment of legislation appropriating \$100,000 so that the fleet class of the Naval Reserve may be established at the full authorized strength of 12,500 enlisted men, which was ordered to lie on the table.

PROTECTION OF DRY STATES FROM LIQUOR SHIPMENTS

Mr. BILBO. Mr. President, several of my colleagues and I have united in the introduction of certain proposed legislation. I have here a petition from one community of my State—Corinth, Miss.—concerning that proposed legislation. I present it for reference to the proper committee, and ask that the body of the petition, signed by 367 citizens, be made part of my remarks in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the petition was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, without the signatures, as follows:

To the HONORABLE UNITED STATES SENATOR THEODORE G. BILBO:

We, the undersigned citizens of Corinth, Miss., being interested in the health and morals of the people of our city and State, sincerely believe the liquor traffic is enhanced because the Federal Government issues license to liquor dealers in Mississippi, a prohibition State.

We further believe that the Federal Government by issuing such license is promoting the welfare of those who violate our State prohibition laws.

Therefore, we urge you to take such steps as are in your power and as are necessary under the law, to put into effect laws that will prevent the issuing of such license in Mississippi and the remaining prohibition States, and to take such other action as you think necessary to give the desired protection.

NAVAL EXPANSION PROGRAM—REPORT

Under authority of the order of the Senate of the 15th instant, Mr. WALSH, from the Committee on Naval Affairs, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 9218) to establish the composition of the United States Navy, to authorize the construction of certain naval vessels, and for other purposes, reported it on April 18, 1938, with amendments and submitted a report (No. 1611) thereon.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA TAXES—REPORT

Under authority of the order of the Senate of the 15th instant, Mr. KING, from the Committee on the District of Columbia, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 10066) to amend the District of Columbia Revenue Act of 1937, and for other purposes, reported it on April 18, 1938, with amendments and submitted a report (No. 1612) thereon.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

Mr. HUGHES, from the Committee on Immigration, to which were referred the following bills, reported them each without amendment and submitted reports thereon:

S. 3633. A bill authorizing the naturalization of Albin H. Youngquist, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 1613); and S. 3758. A bill for the relief of Emily Gertrude Toby (Rept. No. 1614).

Mr. OVERTON, from the Committee on Commerce, to which was referred the bill (S. 3354) to amend the act entitled "An act to amend the act entitled 'An act for the control of floods on the Mississippi River and its tributaries, and for other purposes', approved May 15, 1928", approved June 15, 1936, reported it with amendments and submitted a report (No. 1615) thereon.

Mr. SCHWELLENBACH, from the Committee on Immigration, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 6391) to authorize the prompt deportation of criminals and certain other aliens, and for other purposes, reported it with amendments and submitted a report (No. 1616) thereon.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to which was referred the bill (S. 3490) for the relief of Benjamin H. Faith, reported it without amendment and submitted a report (No. 1617) thereon.

Mr. COPELAND, from the Committee on Commerce, to which were referred the following bills, reported them each with amendments and submitted a report as indicated:

S. 3078. A bill to amend the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 1618); and S. 3845. A bill to create a Civil Aeronautics Authority, and to promote the development and safety and to provide for the regulation of civil aeronautics.

Mr. COPELAND also, from the Committee on the District of Columbia, to which were referred the following bills, reported them each with amendments and submitted reports thereon:

H. R. 6869. A bill to regulate the occupation and practices of cosmetology, to create a District of Columbia Board of Cosmetology for the examination and licensing of persons to carry on or to teach such practices, to insure the better education of such practitioners, to provide rules regulating the proper conduct and sanitation of cosmetological establishments and schools, for the protection of the public health, and to provide penalties for violation thereof (Rept. No. 1622); and

H. R. 7085. A bill to regulate barbers in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 1623).

Mr. SHEPPARD, from the Committee on Commerce, to which were referred the following bills, reported them each without amendment and submitted reports thereon:

S. 3611. A bill to further extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Missouri River between the towns of Decatur, Nebr., and Onawa, Iowa (Rept. No. 1620); and

H. R. 9286. A bill to extend the time for completing the construction of a bridge across the Ohio River at or near Cairo, Ill. (Rept. No. 1621).

Mr. BARKLEY, from the Committee on Banking and Currency, to which was referred the bill (S. 2344) to provide

for the regulation of the sale of certain securities in interstate and foreign commerce, and the trust indentures under which the same are issued, and for other purposes, reported it with amendments and submitted a report (No. 1619) thereon.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. McNARY:

A bill (S. 3854) to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Columbia River at Astoria, Clatsop County, Oreg.; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. GREEN:

A bill (S. 3855) for the relief of Gardiner & Lake; to the Committee on Claims.

A bill (S. 3856) for the relief of Charles Proulx; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. BULKLEY:

A bill (S. 3857) for the relief of Arrena J. Longman; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. LEWIS:

A bill (S. 3858) to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of the Borg-Warner Corporation; and

A bill (S. 3859) to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claims of Robert Henry Parry, trading as American Ladies and Gentlemen's Designing School, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. RUSSELL:

A bill (S. 3860) to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to cooperate with the States or political subdivisions thereof in the development, operation, and maintenance of recreational areas within national forests and on lands owned by the said States or the political subdivisions thereof; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. COPELAND:

A bill (S. 3861) relating to the maximum rate of interest on loans secured by Government life-insurance policies; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. SHIPSTEAD:

A bill (S. 3862) for the relief of Rogowski Bros.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. BYRD:

A bill (S. 3863) granting an increase of pension to Katharine H. Fuller; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. McCARRAN:

A bill (S. 3864) to create a Civil Aeronautics Authority and to promote the development and safety and to provide for the regulation of civil aeronautics; to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

HOUSE BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION REFERRED

The following bills and joint resolution were severally read twice by their titles and referred or ordered to be placed on the calendar as indicated below:

H. R. 6243. An act to authorize a survey of the old Indian trail and highway known as "Oglethorpe Trail" with a view of constructing a national roadway on this route to be known as the "Oglethorpe National Trail and Parkway"; and

H. R. 8008. An act to provide for the purchase of public lands for home and other sites; to the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys.

H. R. 7880. An act to amend the Veterans' Regulation No. 10, pertaining to "line of duty" for peacetime veterans, their widows and dependents, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Pensions.

H. R. 8936. An act authorizing a per capita payment of \$15 each to the members of the Red Lake Band of Chippewa Indians from the proceeds of the sale of timber and lumber on the Red Lake Reservation; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

H. R. 9601. An act to amend the acts for promoting the circulation of reading matter among the blind; to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

H. R. 9721. An act authorizing the disbursement of funds appropriated for compensation of help for care of material, animals, armament, and equipment in the hands of the National Guard of the several States, Territories, and the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

H. R. 10085. An act to authorize the payment of an indemnity to the Norwegian Government in full and final satisfaction of all claims based on the detention and treatment of the crew of the Norwegian steamer *Sagatind* subsequent to the seizure of this vessel by the U. S. Coast Guard cutter *Seneca* on October 12, 1924; to the calendar.

H. J. Res. 622. Joint resolution authorizing the President of the United States of America to proclaim October 11, 1938, General Pulaski's Memorial Day for the observance and commemoration of the death of Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

NAVAL EXPANSION PROGRAM—AMENDMENTS

Mr. BONE submitted two amendments intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 9218) to establish the composition of the United States Navy, to authorize the construction of certain naval vessels, and for other purposes, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

SEPARATION OF PRODUCTION AND MARKETING OF PETROLEUM PRODUCTS—AMENDMENT

Mr. BORAH submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 3752) to divorce the businesses of production, refining, and transporting of petroleum products from that of marketing petroleum products, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary and ordered to be printed.

AMENDMENT TO AGRICULTURAL DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. CONNALLY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 10238) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture and for the Farm Credit Administration for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1939, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed, as follows:

At the proper place in the bill to insert the following:

"For the purpose of the provisions (relating to cotton price adjustment payments with respect to the 1937 cotton crop) of the Third Deficiency Appropriation Act, fiscal year 1937, cotton not sold prior to September 10, 1937, shall be held and considered to have been sold on a date when the average price of $\frac{3}{8}$ -inch middling cotton on the 10 designated spot markets was less than 9 cents per pound and the date of sale, if any, shall not be required to be established for such cotton. An application made as prescribed by the Secretary shall be acceptable as the basis for payment; and such payments shall be made as soon as practicable to all producers who agree to comply with the 1938 agricultural adjustment program, subject, however, to the further agreement of each such producer to refund any such payment made to him, forthwith upon demand by the Secretary, in case such producer fails to comply with such program."

FEDERAL ASSISTANCE TO PUBLIC EDUCATION—AMENDMENT

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, during the first session of the Seventy-fifth Congress the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. HARRISON] and former Senator Black, of Alabama, introduced Senate bill 419, entitled "A bill to promote the general welfare through the appropriation of funds to assist the States and Territories in providing more effective programs of public education."

Extensive hearings were held upon the bill, and the Senate Committee on Education and Labor reported the bill favorably, and it was placed on the calendar, being Calendar No. 224, Report No. 217.

In the meantime the President of the United States appointed the Advisory Committee on Education, with instructions to study the whole field of Federal relations to State and local conduct of education, and to report to him in time for action during the session of the Congress in 1938.

The report of the Advisory Committee on Education was submitted to the Congress February 23, 1938, and referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

The Senator from Mississippi and I have consulted with the chairman, the vice chairman, and the secretary of the

Advisory Committee and many other persons conversant with the recommendations of the Advisory Committee, and have had drafted an amendment to Senate bill 419, which we are offering as a substitute for the original provisions of Senate bill 419, with the approval of the Committee on Education and Labor.

I should like to say that the report of the President's Advisory Committee on Education and the investigations on which it is based substantiate practically every conclusion of the report of the Senate Committee on Education and Labor, Report No. 217, of March 19, 1937. Federal assistance to the States in support of public education is an inevitable necessity.

For the information of the Senate I am submitting a comparison of Senate bill 419, now on the Senate Calendar, and the amendment offered by the Senator from Mississippi and me.

Copies of the report of the President's Advisory Committee are available to Senators who are interested in the subject. This report is a summary of the exhaustive studies carried out by the President's Committee and sets out in detail the facts and conclusions upon which this amendment is based.

I desire to call attention to the fact that except for \$1,250,000, no appropriations are to be authorized for the fiscal year beginning in 1938.

Mr. President, in connection with this statement, I ask to have inserted in the RECORD a comparison between the amendment which we now offer and the original Harrison-Black-Fletcher bill, so that the Senate may be informed with respect to the differences between the amendment and the original measure.

There being no objection, the comparison was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PROVISIONS OF S. 419, CALENDAR NO. 224, REPORT NO. 217

1. Federal assistance to the States for public education.
2. Beginning at \$100,000,000 and increasing to \$300,000,000 in 5 years.
3. Grants to States in lump sum to be used for public education as determined by the States, apportioned to States on basis of number of persons 5 to 20 years old in each.

PROVISIONS OF AMENDMENT IN NATURE OF A SUBSTITUTE FOR S. 419, BASED ON REPORT OF THE ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION

1. Federal assistance to the States for public education.
2. Beginning at \$72,000,000 and increasing to \$202,000,000 in 6 years.
3. TITLE I: Grants to the States for the improvement of public elementary and secondary schools.

PART 1. General Federal aid for lessening inequalities of educational opportunity, and apportioned to the States on the basis of financial need as measured by the number of children 5 to 19 years old and ability to support schools, \$40,000,000 in 1939-40, increasing to \$140,000,000 in 1944-45.

PART 2. Aid for improving the facilities for teacher training, and apportioned to the States on the same basis as general aid, \$2,000,000 for 1939-40 and increasing to \$6,000,000 in 1941-42 and thereafter through 1945.

PART 3. Aid for the construction of school buildings, especially those in connection with desirable reorganization of local school districts and apportioned to the States on the same basis as general aid, \$20,000,000 in 1939-40, \$30,000,000 in 1940-41, and thereafter through 1945.

PART 4. Aid for improvement in the facilities of State departments of education and apportioned on the basis of \$5,000 to each State and the remainder on the same basis as general aid, \$1,000,000 in 1939-40, \$1,500,000 in 1940-41, and \$2,000,000 each year thereafter through 1945.

PROVISIONS OF S. 419, CALENDAR NO. 224, REPORT NO. 217—continued

PROVISIONS OF AMENDMENT IN NATURE OF A SUBSTITUTE FOR S. 419, BASED ON REPORT OF THE ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION—continued

TITLE II. Grants to the States for adult education: For the purpose of stimulating and enabling the States to make adequate provision for civic, part-time, vocational, and general adult educational services, grants are authorized to the States on the basis of adult population 20 years of age and over in the amount of \$5,000,000 in 1939-40, \$10,000,000 in 1940-41, and \$15,000,000 each year thereafter through 1945.

TITLE III. Grants to the States for rural library service: For the purpose of stimulating and enabling the States to provide adequate library services for rural inhabitants of the States, grants are authorized to the States on the basis of rural population in the amount of \$2,000,000 in 1939-40, \$4,000,000 in 1940-41, and \$6,000,000 for each year thereafter through 1945.

TITLE IV. Grants for cooperative research, planning, and demonstrations: For the purpose of making necessary surveys and plans in connection with the best utilization of grants to States and for other cooperative educational research, planning, and demonstration projects there is authorized the sum of \$1,250,000 in 1938-39, \$2,000,000 in 1939-40, and \$3,000,000 for each year thereafter through 1945. Of these amounts, 40 percent will be available to the United States Office of Education and 60 percent will be allotted to the States and bona fide research agencies.

TITLE V. Education of children of Federal wards, employees residing on Federal reservations and at foreign stations. The funds for this purpose are for purely Federal responsibilities and definite amounts are not fixed. The best estimations available indicate \$3,000,000 annually.

4. Federal control of public education prohibited (sec. 11).

5. Standards to be met by States:

(a) No reduction in State and local funds below amounts spent in year ending in 1936 (sec. 8).

(b) School term of 160 days.

(c) Just and equitable apportionment of funds among schools for separate races in States where separate schools are maintained.

(d) Provision for adequate reports and audits.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, also for the information of the Senate I ask that a copy of the list of the personnel of the Advisory Committee on Education be inserted in the RECORD in connection with these remarks.

There being no objection, the list was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PERSONNEL OF THE ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION

Educators: Chairman, Floyd W. Reeves, professor of education, University of Chicago; Edmund de S. Brunner, professor of rural

4. Federal control of public education prohibited (sec. 51, sec. 208, sec. 308 (b)).

5. Standards to be met by States:

(a) No reduction in State funds below amounts spent in year ending in 1938 (sec. 52).

(b) Provide a plan of apportionment to local school jurisdictions that will most effectively lessen inequalities of educational opportunities within the State.

(c) Just and equitable apportionment of funds among schools for separate races in States where separate schools are maintained.

(d) Provision for adequate records and audits.

sociology, Teachers College, Columbia University, New York City; Frank P. Graham, president, University of North Carolina; Charles H. Judd, head, department of education, University of Chicago; Arthur B. Moehlman, editor, the Nation's Schools, Ann Arbor, Mich.; and George F. Zook, president, American Council on Education, Washington.

Government officials: Oscar L. Chapman, Assistant Secretary of the Interior; Gordon R. Clapp, director of personnel, Tennessee Valley Authority, Knoxville; Ernest G. Draper, Assistant Secretary of Commerce; Mordecai Ezekiel, economic adviser to the Secretary, Department of Agriculture; and Miss Katharine F. Lenroot, Chief, Children's Bureau.

Labor: Miss Elisabeth Christman, secretary-treasurer, National Women's Trade Union League, Washington; George L. Googe, chairman, Southern Organizing Committee, American Federation of Labor, Atlanta; and Thomas Kennedy, Lieutenant Governor, Pennsylvania, and secretary-treasurer, United Mine Workers.

Business: William Rowland Allen, personnel director, L. S. Ayres & Co., Indianapolis; T. J. Thomas, president, Valler Coal Co., Chicago; and John H. Zink, president, Heat & Power Corporation, Baltimore.

Other members: Miss Alice L. Edwards, home economist, New York City; Luther Gulick, director, Institute of Public Administration, New York City; Rev. George Johnson, National Catholic Welfare Conference, Washington; and Henry C. Taylor, director, Farm Foundation, Chicago.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, I now ask that the amendment which we are to offer as a substitute at the proper time may be now presented and lie on the table, and that it may be printed.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the proposed amendment will be received, printed, and lie on the table.

TREATIES WITH DEBTOR NATIONS AND RIGHTS OF THE SENATE

Mr. LEWIS. Mr. President, I submit a resolution and ask that it be read, and then that it may lie on the table for the purpose of affording the basis of my addressing the Senate at an appropriate time upon the resolution.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the clerk will read the resolution.

The Chief Clerk read the resolution (S. Res. 267), as follows:

Resolved, That the Department of State, if not incompatible with the public interest, transmit at the earliest convenience to the United States Senate the terms and form of any trade agreement or reciprocal treaty with either of the nations that are now in debt to the United States where the indebtedness is not in anywise being adjusted or the interest of same being paid or in anywise the basis of present financial settlement. That such proposed trade treaty be transmitted to the Senate in detail as offered by the United States or as tendered by the debtor nations; that the United States may in the fulfillment of its authority review the treaty and submit to the State Department or the President of the United States such suggestions of revision, amendment, ratification, or rejection as the Senate would feel necessary to the welfare of the United States of America. It is herein expressed that the United States assumes that it is not within the power of the State Department of the United States Government to make any treaty or trade agreement that involves a sovereignty of any foreign nation with the sovereignty of the United States of America without the United States Senate having the privilege to treat the same treaty as a compact wherein the United States Senate must ratify or take action on the same within the privilege of its duty under the Constitution of the United States.

Mr. LEWIS. I now ask that the resolution lie on the table, subject to a further motion, when I shall ask the privilege of addressing the Senate upon it.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I hope the Senator from Illinois will not call up the resolution during the absence of some of us, for it is of such great importance that we may desire to submit some observations in opposition.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution submitted by the Senator from Illinois, which he suggests he hopes to discuss later, will be printed and lie on the table.

COMMITTEE SERVICE

On motion by Mr. McNARY, it was

Ordered, That the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN] be discharged from further service on the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds and that the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] be appointed to fill the vacancy.

TRIBUTE TO SENATOR NORRIS BY DOROTHY THOMPSON

[Mr. BONE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a tribute to Senator NORRIS, delivered over the radio on April 1, 1938, by Dorothy Thompson, which appears in the Appendix.]

FOUNDING OF THE STATE OF DELAWARE

[Mr. LUNDEEN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD addresses made at the University of Delaware on March 29 on the subject of the founding of the State of Delaware.]

ADDITIONAL APPROPRIATION FOR CIVILIAN CONSERVATION CORPS

Mr. GLASS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate consider at this time House Joint Resolution 627, which provides for an additional appropriation of \$50,000,000 for the Civilian Conservation Corps.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will read the resolution by title.

The CHIEF CLERK. A resolution (H. J. Res. 627) providing an additional appropriation for the Civilian Conservation Corps for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1939.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the joint resolution, which was read, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That for an additional amount for all authorized and necessary expenses of the Civilian Conservation Corps in carrying into effect the provisions of the act entitled "An act to establish a Civilian Conservation Corps, and for other purposes," approved June 28, 1937, there is hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1939, the sum of \$22,000,000, and in addition thereto there is hereby reappropriated and made available for such purpose the unobligated balance on June 30, 1938, of the appropriation "Civilian Conservation Corps, 1938," and of the total amount made available hereby not less than \$30,000,000 shall be available only for pay, subsistence, clothing (and repair thereof), transportation, and hospitalization of enrollees. The foregoing appropriation and reappropriation shall be added to, and be available for the same objects of expenditure and within the limitations specified in, the appropriation for the Civilian Conservation Corps in the Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1939, and no part of the amounts made available hereby shall be used for the construction of any new camps.

Mr. OVERTON. I offer an amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 2, line 12, it is proposed, after the word "camps", to insert "The same percentage of drainage camps shall be continued during the fiscal year 1939 as were in operation during the first half of the fiscal year 1938."

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, the purpose of this amendment is to assure the continuance during the next fiscal year of the drainage camps. There are two such drainage camps in Delaware, five in Illinois, six in Indiana, five in Iowa, two in Kentucky, five in Louisiana, three in Maryland, four in Missouri, and seven in Ohio. These drainage camps are doing valuable work, particularly in the State of Louisiana, where I am more familiar with their operations than I am in the other States.

According to official reports I have received, the number of people benefited by the 5 drainage camps in the State of Louisiana was 175,775; the number of landowners benefited was 12,128; the number of acres benefited was 557,822; the miles of ditches cleared numbered 535; the miles of ditches excavated aggregated 495; the number of spoil banks leveled, 67, and the number of drainage boards cooperating, 72.

Permit me to say to the Senator from Utah that, as I understand the situation, there is no intention on the part of the administration to decrease the number of camps other than drainage camps and Army camps.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. OVERTON. I yield to the Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. MILLER. Does the amendment which the Senator has offered undertake to freeze the number of drainage camps, or to prevent the establishment of other drainage camps in lieu of camps that may be discontinued?

Mr. OVERTON. No; the amendment merely provides that the same percentage of drainage camps as are now provided shall be continued during the next fiscal year.

I understand that there is a possibility that the drainage camps will be entirely discontinued. The purpose of the amendment I have offered is to authorize the continuance of the same percentage of drainage camps that has existed dur-

ing the present fiscal year, and to continue that program during the next fiscal year.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. OVERTON. I yield.

Mr. MILLER. Under the terms of the amendment, as I understand, there is not anything to prevent the creation of additional drainage camps. The amendment merely prevents a reduction of the number below the present number.

Mr. OVERTON. That is correct.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. OVERTON. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. I am in sympathy with what the Senator has in mind, because I am interested in the drainage camps, and they are performing an excellent service in reclaiming for cultivation a great deal of very fertile land. Some of this work is being done under the malarial-protection activities of the Bureau of the Public Health Service, but I am wondering whether it is really wise to earmark any of this fund for a particular type of camp.

Mr. OVERTON. I will say to the Senator from Kentucky that my purpose in doing so is to save the drainage camps.

Mr. BARKLEY. The object of the joint resolution is to preserve the number of camps that are now in existence. The \$50,000,000 fund does not permit the creation of any additional camps of any sort. It simply obviates the necessity of abandoning about 300 camps which are already scheduled for closing on the 1st day of July. I think not only the Civilian Conservation Corps but the Bureau of the Public Health Service are interested in preserving the drainage camps, and I certainly desire to see them preserved. I should like to see them increased.

Mr. OVERTON. I am advised that unless some provision of this kind is inserted in the joint resolution the drainage camps will disappear from the picture.

Mr. BARKLEY. I have not conferred with the Bureau of Agricultural Engineering or with the C. C. C., but I understood that they had contemplated a reduction of the drainage camps because they had to reduce the total number of camps by 300, and the drainage camps were among those that were to be reduced; but, now that we are preserving the status quo as to number, I am wondering whether there is really any danger of losing the drainage camps.

Mr. OVERTON. I will state to the Senator from Kentucky that I think there is.

Mr. GLASS. Mr. President, that is a matter which the Senate will have to decide. The committee has not considered it at all; and until today I had no notice of any purpose to offer an amendment to the joint resolution, or I would not have brought it up under a promise that it would not lead to any discussion.

Mr. OVERTON. The situation in that connection is that when the Senate Appropriations Committee met for the purpose of considering this joint resolution I was present, and stated to the chairman of the committee that I wished to offer this amendment to the joint resolution and desired to offer evidence in support of it. He advised me that the joint resolution would not be taken up on that day, and that it would await a report from the Bureau of the Budget. Subsequently the Appropriations Committee convened under a notice that it would take up the legislative appropriation bill. I was unable to be present at the time the committee met. I did not know they were going to take up the C. C. C. joint resolution. It was taken up during my absence. For that reason I did not have an opportunity to offer the amendment, but I had advised the chairman of the Appropriations Committee that I desired to offer it.

The amendment will not interfere with the program that is contemplated by the joint resolution. I assume that the joint resolution contemplates that an appropriation will be made to continue these camps.

Mr. GLASS. All existing camps.

Mr. OVERTON. All existing camps; and all I wish to be assured of is that they will be continued. It is my infor-

mation that it is upon the program, in all probability, to discontinue all of the drainage camps.

In certain States the drainage camps are of more value than any other C. C. C. camps. I think I can say that for the State of Louisiana, and I think possibly I can also say that for the State of Ohio. They are used in the States I mentioned a while ago—Delaware, Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maryland, Missouri, and Ohio—and in those States they do very essential work, and they work in cooperation with the drainage districts which are public agencies of the Government. We in Louisiana consider them as essential as any other camps. The sole purpose of the amendment is to continue the program in reference to the drainage camps for the next fiscal year, and I hope the Senator from Virginia will accept the amendment.

Mr. GLASS. Mr. President, I cannot accept the amendment, because I do not know what the purpose of the C. C. C. authorities is beyond their statement that this appropriation is to avoid abolition of 300 existing C. C. C. camps. The question very naturally arises, if a part of this fund, amounting to over \$7,000,000, should be earmarked for some particular purpose, would it not involve the abolition of some of the camps in other States?

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, if the Senator from Louisiana will yield to me, an appeal was made to me by certain persons interested in a type of grazing camp that is used on the public domain. They heard a rumor that that type of camp was to be discontinued.

Mr. OVERTON. The reclamation camps are not to be discontinued.

Mr. HAYDEN. No; but these camps were established under the Taylor Grazing Act. I was asked to do just what the Senator has in mind, to earmark the appropriation. It seemed to me that if we started in to do that, we should label every kind of C. C. C. camp there is in the United States, and say that it should not be changed. I do not see how the committee could consistently do that.

Mr. GLASS. I am not authorized by the committee to do that.

Mr. PITTMAN. Mr. President—

Mr. OVERTON. I yield to the Senator from Nevada.

Mr. PITTMAN. There are certain C. C. C. camps in the Western States which have been performing work on what we call private irrigation districts. That is, a district was formed under the law of the State. It sold its bonds. It built its dams and its reservoirs. The district is connected with the State. Some of the camps have been established in those districts to aid with regard to flood control where there are washouts or cloudbursts, and to remove obstructions, and they have even been established to a certain extent in connection with Indian reservations. All of those districts want to retain their C. C. C. camps, and we have been petitioned to request the Government to retain them. The answer we have received from the Interior Department is that the order now is that the money shall be used only for C. C. C. camps on Government land or Government projects, and that these districts being private districts, the C. C. C. camps cannot be continued there.

Mr. OVERTON. I may say to the Senator from Nevada that the drainage camps do not work on private land. They work on ditches and drains that are owned and controlled by drainage districts.

Mr. PITTMAN. State drainage districts, or national districts?

Mr. OVERTON. They are recognized political subdivisions organized under State law.

Mr. BARKLEY. They are on private land, though.

Mr. PITTMAN. Yes; and the situation in Nevada is exactly the same. The land in the district is owned by the district, which is a subdivision of the State; but it is not a Federal reservation or reclamation project. These camps in the past have been doing valuable work in private reclamation districts; but I am informed by the Secretary of the Interior that the proclamation of the President limits

the activities of C. C. C. camps exclusively to work on Government land, or other Government property, or in Government reclamation districts. If the act is to be changed, it will be absolutely essential for us to state that in all camps where work has been going on and where the work is not completed, it shall be completed. If that is to be the rule, we might as well go through with it.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, I desire to ask the Senator from Virginia one or two questions about the joint resolution itself.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Louisiana has the floor. Does the Senator from Louisiana yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. OVERTON. I yield to the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I notice that the joint resolution, in addition to a direct appropriation of \$22,000,000, reappropriates the unobligated balance on June 30 of the 1938 appropriation. How much is that unobligated balance?

Mr. GLASS. It brings the total up to \$50,000,000.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I ask the Senator whether the \$50,000,000 would permit the operation of all camps which have heretofore been operated, or, if not, what proportion of them?

Mr. GLASS. It would merely prevent the discontinuance of 300 camps now existing. They would have to be abolished on the 1st of July unless the appropriation were made.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Are there any others which will be abolished in spite of this appropriation?

Mr. GLASS. That I do not know.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, may I make a suggestion to the Senator from Michigan?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Louisiana has the floor. Does he yield?

Mr. OVERTON. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. The information given the committee was that this appropriation would keep the camps going substantially as at present, in substantially the same numbers. There would be no increase and no diminution.

Mr. VANDENBERG. With the consent of the Senator from Louisiana, I should like to ask how much was appropriated for the C. C. C. in the regular appropriation bill?

Mr. McKELLAR. I would have to get the bill in order to answer the Senator.

Mr. VANDENBERG. In other words, how much are we to spend this year, as a total, on the C. C. C. camps?

Mr. McKELLAR. I will get the bill and see what the appropriation is.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield to me?

Mr. OVERTON. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. The \$50,000,000 is supposed to make it possible to preserve 300 camps. There are altogether 1,250 camps in existence, I understand, so that if \$50,000,000 represents 300, it is easy to calculate how much 1,250 camps cost. I have not the figures here at the moment.

Mr. VANDENBERG. It might be pertinent to know whether it is \$200,000,000 or \$300,000,000 or \$400,000,000. However, I do not want to raise any inconsequential question.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield?

Mr. OVERTON. I yield.

Mr. KING. I should like to ask either the Senator from Louisiana or the Senator from Virginia whether or not, if the joint resolution shall be enacted, all the camps which it is contemplated abandoning if we do not make the appropriation are to be continued in operation, whether the number is to be "frozen" during the next year, or whether there is to be authority in the organization to abandon some which are not needed, and to place the camps at places where they are needed?

Mr. OVERTON. According to my understanding the program is a continuous one. Some camps are abandoned, new camps are established, and the work goes on.

Mr. KING. If the intention is to close camps whose effective and valuable work has been completed and to transfer their activities to other places, that is one thing.

Mr. OVERTON. I think that is the intention.

Mr. KING. If the joint resolution contemplates the continuation of camps which should be closed, it seems to me there ought to be an amendment.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, the joint resolution as it is brought before us merely adds \$50,000,000 for the Civilian Conservation Service to continue the policies they have heretofore adopted. Wherever a camp is located, when it finished its work, of course, it would be moved somewhere else. So far as I know, none of the camps have ever been located in any community that was willing to give them up, even when the work was finished. They would always find something else they would like to have the camps do. But the additional appropriation leaves the matter in statu quo, so that if any camp has finished its work, it may be moved to some other point. Whether they are drainage camps, soil-conservation camps, or forestry camps, whatever their nature, the community which has them wants to keep them, and the question which confronts me, as a Member of the Senate, is whether we ought to say that this appropriation shall be earmarked so as to keep a certain type of camp in existence, without doing the same as to all the others, because in the communities where the camps exist the people are proud of them and are anxious to keep them.

Mr. GLASS. Mr. President, if the Senator from Louisiana will yield, the simple purpose of the joint resolution is to avoid the discontinuance of 300 C. C. C. camps. The national presumption is that if any were discontinued, the least desirable of them would be discontinued. But the committee felt that the authorities having jurisdiction of the C. C. C. camps ought to be permitted to exercise their own judgment about it. The committee did not know how to exercise any judgment about matters of that sort, indeed, had no judgment about it.

I will now answer, if I may, the inquiry of the Senator from Michigan. The total appropriation for C. C. C. camps in the general appropriation bill is \$226,331,000, and the appropriation in the joint resolution is in addition to that amount.

Mr. VANDENBERG. So, if the Senator will permit, that makes a total of \$276,000,000.

Mr. GLASS. Yes.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Can the Senator tell me how many young men this \$276,000,000 cares for in these camps?

Mr. GLASS. No; I cannot. My sole interest in the matter was to prevent the discontinuance of 300 C. C. C. camps.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana permit me to ask him a question?

Mr. OVERTON. I yield.

Mr. VANDENBERG. If the Senator from Tennessee is correct in this statement to me that this would permit the continuance of practically all existing camps, why is there any necessity for protecting drainage camps, or any other kind of camp?

Mr. OVERTON. If I had the assurance that the drainage camps would not be done away with, I would be perfectly willing to withdraw the amendment.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Is the Senator from Tennessee justified in his statement that the appropriation will permit the continuation of all existing C. C. C. camps?

Mr. OVERTON. That is my understanding.

Mr. VANDENBERG. That it will permit it?

Mr. OVERTON. That there will be sufficient funds, but that it is proposed to do away with the drainage camps, which are so essentially a part of this program in a certain number of States.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, the Senator has said it is contemplated. Has the Senator that information from the authorities, the Bureau of Agricultural Engineering, and the Civilian Conservation Service?

Mr. OVERTON. The Bureau of Agricultural Engineering, I understand, is very anxious to continue these drainage camps.

Mr. BARKLEY. I so understand.

Mr. OVERTON. But it is my understanding that in all probability Mr. Fechner contemplates abolishing the drainage camps.

Mr. BARKLEY. Did the Senator get that information from Mr. Fechner?

Mr. OVERTON. I talked with Mr. Fechner, and he would give me no assurance at all that they were going to continue the drainage camps. On the contrary, as I understand the statement he made to me, it is contemplated that the drainage camps will cease to exist; that is, within a very limited time. There is certain work it is desired to finish in certain of the drainage camps, and it will be completed, probably, at the end of this fiscal year.

Mr. LOGAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield?

Mr. OVERTON. I yield.

Mr. LOGAN. I will ask the Senator from Louisiana whether it is not pretty generally understood, and has been for several months, that all drainage camps are going to be abandoned, and that his amendment is to prevent the authorities abandoning drainage camps and using the camps for some other purpose.

Mr. OVERTON. That is the very purpose of the amendment.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. OVERTON. I yield.

Mr. NORRIS. I think the Senate should be assured by evidence, if the amendment of the Senator is to prevail, that these drainage camps or at least some of them, have not completed the work. It would not be wise for us by statute to require the retention of men in a drainage camp after the drainage work had been completed. There would then be no further use for a drainage camp at that place.

Mr. OVERTON. My amendment does not contemplate such a program.

Mr. NORRIS. It does not?

Mr. OVERTON. No; it does not. It merely provides that the same percentage of drainage camps shall be continued. Of course, we authorize them to abolish one drainage camp when it has completed its work, and establish another drainage camp at some other place where the work is necessary.

Mr. PITTMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. OVERTON. I yield.

Mr. PITTMAN. Who owns the land in these drainage districts in Louisiana?

Mr. OVERTON. Some of them are private lands and some of them are public lands.

Mr. PITTMAN. What character of public lands?

Mr. OVERTON. Some of the lands which are in the streams belong to the State, and some that are in the levee districts belong to the State. Some are public and some are private.

Mr. PITTMAN. As I understand, most of this land is private land, included in a State irrigation district for the purpose of having the land drained and placed in cultivation.

Mr. OVERTON. I think that is a correct statement.

Mr. PITTMAN. If it is the policy of the Government now not to expend C. C. C. money on privately owned land, or on State land, as seems to be the case, the Senator is simply making an exception for the benefit of privately owned land in the State of Louisiana.

Mr. OVERTON. But it is the policy today to establish these drainage camps, and it has been the policy heretofore. These drainage camps are being maintained today.

Mr. PITTMAN. So the policy has been in the State of Nevada, but it is now desired to change it. If the Senator from Louisiana wishes to include in the joint resolution a provision with respect to Louisiana, I shall ask to have included a provision with respect to Nevada.

Mr. OVERTON. Very well; I shall agree to that.

Mr. GLASS rose.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Louisiana yield to the Senator from Virginia?

Mr. OVERTON. I shall yield to the Senator from Virginia in a moment.

Mr. President, if the Senator from Nevada will propose an amendment such as he just suggested, I shall be very glad, indeed, to support the amendment. However, I am looking after the drainage camps. The Senator from Nevada may offer such amendment as he may think necessary in order to preserve the reclamation camps.

I now yield to the Senator from Virginia.

Mr. GLASS. Mr. President, in fairness to the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH], unless this matter is speedily closed, I shall have to withdraw my motion to proceed with the consideration of the joint resolution. I told the Senator from Massachusetts that I did not think it would take more than 2 minutes to dispose of the joint resolution, inasmuch as the only proposition involved, so far as I could see, was the avoidance of abandoning 300 camps.

Mr. McKELLAR and Mr. WALSH rose.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Louisiana yield; and if so to whom?

Mr. OVERTON. I yield to the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. WALSH. A parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. WALSH. Has the Senator from Virginia withdrawn the pending measure?

Mr. GLASS. No, Mr. President. I said that unless the matter should be closed in the next 5 minutes I felt that in fairness to the Senator from Massachusetts the joint resolution should be withdrawn.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, Mr. Fechner, in testifying in the hearings before the subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations of the House on the supplemental appropriation for the Civilian Conservation Corps, 1939, said:

If this additional money is allowed—

That is, the \$22,000,000 provided in the pending measure, and the reappropriation of the unexpended balance—

If this additional money is allowed, we will not close any C. C. C. camp with an unfinished project on May 31 except on the War and Navy reservations, and 1,500 camps, with a peak strength of approximately 300,000 enrollees, will be maintained during the fiscal year 1939.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. OVERTON. I yield to the Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. SMATHERS. I wish to say to the Senator from Louisiana that I do not see the necessity of his amendment, because in my State of New Jersey the finest work done by the C. C. C. camps has been the draining of the meadows in south Jersey to eradicate the mosquito, and in the list of States that the Senator gives as having drainage camps he does not include New Jersey. Therefore, I do not understand the necessity of undertaking to earmark some of these funds for drainage camps. I should like to have him explain why he thinks it is necessary by his amendment to earmark funds for these drainage camps.

Mr. OVERTON. If the Senator from New Jersey had been listening to me he would have heard me undertake to present that amendment and give the reasons for it. The men in the C. C. C. drainage camps are doing valuable work. It has been the policy of the Government to establish and operate these drainage camps, and there is no reason presented why they should be discontinued. All Senators who are interested in drainage camps have been informed, as I understand, that the probability is that, notwithstanding the passage of this joint resolution providing an additional appropriation, the drainage camps are going to disappear from the picture.

I ask the Senator from Virginia if he would have any objection to withdrawing his motion until we can have some statement that is official, one way or the other, from Mr. Fechner, as to whether or not the drainage camps are to be continued or whether the drainage camps are to be abolished.

Mr. GLASS. I would not withdraw the motion on that account. I would withdraw it because I promised the Senator from Massachusetts to let him proceed with the bill in which he is interested.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, I will say that if I had had the opportunity to present testimony before the committee, I think I could have presented testimony from the Department of Agriculture as to the great advantage in having drainage camps, and the valuable work these drainage camps are doing. Unfortunately I did not have that opportunity, and the matter was taken up hurriedly and without any notice by the Senate Appropriations Committee. I did not have the opportunity to present certain witnesses from the different Departments of the Government whom I would have liked to present to the committee.

Mr. GLASS. Mr. President, let us vote on the proposition now.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. HUGHES. Mr. President, may we have the amendment stated?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will state the amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 2, line 12, it is proposed, after the word "camps", to insert:

The same percentage of drainage camps shall be continued during the fiscal year 1939 as were in operation during the first half of the fiscal year 1938.

Mr. SCHWARTZ. Mr. President, I desire to ask the Senator from Louisiana a question.

Mr. OVERTON. I yield to the Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. SCHWARTZ. Will the Senator tell us what effect, if any, his amendment will have on other C. C. C. camps throughout the country? In order to maintain the number of drainage camps at the number we have had heretofore, as provided by the Senator's amendment, will it not be necessary to reduce the number of C. C. C. camps elsewhere?

Mr. OVERTON. I do not understand that any other C. C. C. camps will be lost by reason of the amendment. The purpose of the amendment is simply to continue the drainage camps along with the other camps, and I do not understand there will be any reduction in the number of camps as the result of this amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON].

The amendment was rejected.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the third reading and passage of the joint resolution.

Mr. McADOO. Mr. President, I offer an amendment which I should like to have stated.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. At the appropriate place in the joint resolution it is proposed to insert the following:

That the salary of the Director of the Civilian Conservation Corps be restored to the sum of \$12,000 per annum.

Mr. McADOO. Mr. President, the purpose of the amendment is simply to correct a grave injustice which I think was done by the Congress a short time ago in reducing the salary of Colonel Fechner from \$12,000 to \$10,000 per annum. Colonel Fechner has proved himself to be one of the most efficient officers of the Government. I know of no man in charge of such important work as that of the Civilian Conservation Corps, who has performed a finer service than Colonel Fechner has performed.

At the same time that his salary was being reduced from \$12,000 to \$10,000 a year the salary of Mr. Hopkins, the Director of the W. P. A., was reduced a similar amount. Subsequently the Congress restored Mr. Hopkins' salary to \$12,000 a year, as I recall, and I simply ask that this act of simple justice be done to an excellent public official by correcting the previous injustice and restoring his salary to \$12,000 per annum.

Mr. GLASS. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. GLASS. Is not that amendment subject to a point of order on the score that it is legislation on an appropriation measure?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The joint resolution under consideration is not a general appropriation measure.

Mr. GLASS. Very well. Let us have a vote on the amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from California [Mr. McADOO].

The amendment was rejected.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the third reading of the joint resolution.

The joint resolution was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

NAVAL-EXPANSION PROGRAM

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to consider House bill 9218, being Calendar No. 1681.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will report the bill by title.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (H. R. 9218) to establish the composition of the United States Navy, to authorize the construction of certain naval vessels, and for other purposes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Massachusetts.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 9218) to establish the composition of the United States Navy, to authorize the construction of certain naval vessels, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Naval Affairs with amendments.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Massachusetts desire that the committee amendments be first considered?

Mr. WALSH. I ask unanimous consent that the committee amendments be considered first.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none. The clerk will state the first amendment of the committee.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Adams	Dieterich	Lee	Radcliffe
Andrews	Donahay	Lewis	Reames
Ashurst	Duffy	Lodge	Reynolds
Austin	Ellender	Logan	Russell
Bailey	Frazier	Lonergan	Schwartz
Bankhead	George	Lundeen	Schwellenbach
Barkley	Gerry	McAdoo	Sheppard
Berry	Gillette	McCarran	Shipstead
Bilbo	Glass	McGill	Smathers
Bone	Green	McKellar	Smith
Borah	Hale	McNary	Thomas, Utah
Bridges	Harrison	Maloney	Townsend
Brown, Mich.	Hatch	Miller	Truman
Brown, N. H.	Hayden	Milton	Tydings
Bulkley	Herring	Minton	Vandenberg
Bulow	Hill	Murray	Van Nuys
Byrd	Hitchcock	Neely	Wagner
Byrnes	Holt	Norris	Walsh
Capper	Hughes	Nye	Wheeler
Caraway	Johnson, Calif.	O'Mahoney	White
Chavez	Johnson, Colo.	Overt	
Connally	King	Pittman	
Copeland	La Follette	Pope	

The VICE PRESIDENT. Eighty-nine Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present. The Senator from Massachusetts has the floor.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, I think this is the appropriate time to make an explanation of the bill.

At the close of the World War we had the largest Navy in the world, a Navy unsurpassed by any other navy. In 1922 we joined with other nations in holding a conference for the limitation of naval armaments. As the result of that conference a limit was placed, by our own choosing, and in agreement with other nations, upon the size of our Navy in certain categories of naval vessels, principally capital ships, known as battleships and also aircraft carriers. As a result of the agreements entered into among the five great powers at that time—Great Britain, Japan, France, Italy, and

ourselves—we surrendered the position which we had theretofore held as the leading naval power of the world. From that day to this we have never been, and are not today, the leading naval power.

At the conference of 1922 the famous 5-5-3 ratio was accepted as a naval-limitation principle among the three principal powers—Great Britain, Japan, and our country. We scrapped several capital ships in process of construction and suffered a loss of \$180,000,000 as a result of that agreement.

From that day to this we have honestly and scrupulously sought to live up to the terms of that agreement. The 5-5-3 ratio was reached and agreed upon by the various nations after long study and consideration of what were the naval needs of Great Britain, Japan, and our own country. Consideration was given to such factors as island possessions beyond the mainland of each country, trade routes which ought to be protected and maintained in order that the people might sustain themselves—that being particularly true of Great Britain—location of naval bases, and the protection needs of each country against the naval bases of a possible enemy country being in too close proximity. All the parties solemnly agreed and signed the agreement for a ratio of 5-5-3, which was considered sufficient for each of the countries, and was expected to tend to promote and maintain peace among them, and, in the event of war, to give no country an undue advantage over the others.

The conference of 1922 was only the beginning, the first step toward limitation of naval armaments. It dealt with only two categories of naval vessels, battleships and aircraft carriers. There was no limitation upon such effective naval craft as cruisers and destroyers, there was no limitation upon submarines, and there was no limitation upon airplanes.

After 1922 we continued to live up to the terms of the agreement of 1922, which was known as the Washington Treaty. In 1930 another conference of the great nations was held for the purpose of attempting additional limitations in naval armaments, particularly in the categories which were not included in the Washington Treaty.

The conference in London in 1930 reiterated and again sanctioned the 5-5-3 ratio. It expanded somewhat the categories of naval craft which were to be limited, and cruisers, destroyers, and submarines were included. But at no time had there been any agreement limiting or restricting airplanes or airships to be used by the navies of these countries.

The London Treaty remained in operation from 1930 to December 31, 1936, when it appeared because of limitation and failure it was discontinued.

After the conference of 1930 we were made to realize that we were much below the 5-5-3 ratio in the extent and scope of our Navy. Let me add that we have never maintained and are not at this hour maintaining the 5-5-3 ratio.

In 1934, upon the recommendation of the President, the Congress passed the so-called Vinson-Trammell Act, which was somewhat like the bill now before the Senate for consideration, in that it merely provided an authorization of law. It was an attempt, through authorization on the part of Congress, to indicate to the world that we intended to build up to the 5-5-3 ratio. Briefly stated, the Vinson-Trammell Act authorized the President to proceed to build up to the ratio of 5-5-3 at such times as he chose and under such circumstances as he chose. As a result, we have been building new naval vessels since the passage of that act and have made some progress toward reaching the 5-5-3 ratio.

As I understand the situation, at all the naval armament conferences we have been at a disadvantage in bringing about a real limitation of naval armament, because, aside from the Washington agreement, we were never in the position to make sacrifices of naval vessels. We were always inferior and below the ratio of 5-5-3. When we pleaded for lowering the number and tonnage of naval craft, we were confronted with the argument, by both Great Britain and Japan, that we were asking those countries to scrap and not doing any scrapping ourselves.

We could not scrap, because we were below the 5-5-3 ratio. It is reported by those who represented us at the confer-

ences that the fact which I have stated was a decided disadvantage. The statesmen of the other countries were embarrassed at the prospect of returning to their people and stating that they had sunk millions of dollars worth of naval craft, and that the United States, the richest country of all, had made no sacrifices.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WALSH. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. BORAH. It seems to me that argument might have been met by the fact that in the 1922 naval conference we scrapped far in excess of what any other nation did.

Mr. WALSH. The Senator is absolutely correct. We scrapped far in excess of any other nation. In fact, we were practically the only country which did scrap on a large scale after 1922, although Great Britain did some scrapping and Japan a little.

When the time for the expiration of the 1930 treaty arrived, in 1936, an impasse followed. The other countries were unwilling to proceed further with the treaties. On December 31, 1936, all limitation by agreement between these nations in regard to naval craft ended, and today every nation in the world is as free as it chooses to build as many and as large and as expensive naval vessels as it may determine, with the exception of some minor agreement between Great Britain and ourselves in reference to furnishing information to each other with reference to the size of capital ships and the caliber of guns, and also in reference to size of cruisers.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President—

Mr. WALSH. I yield to the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Before the Senator leaves the Vinson-Trammell Act, may I ask him a question for information respecting it?

Mr. WALSH. Certainly.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Am I correct in recollecting that the total authorizations under the Vinson-Trammell Act were in the neighborhood of \$4,000,000,000?

Mr. WALSH. I am pleased that the Senator has asked that question. I shall discuss it. I had intended to discuss it later, but I will do so now.

There has been wide circulation of the story that the Vinson-Trammell Act provided authorizations involving expenditures for our Navy in the amount of \$4,000,000,000. That, however, is not true. The story with relation to the \$4,000,000,000 authorizations originated from the fact—and I desire this to be made clear and definite—that the replacement value of our entire Navy today, if we had to replace it, would be \$4,000,000,000. That is how the story in regard to the \$4,000,000,000 arose. Of course, if that were so, when we add the \$1,000,000,000 of which I will speak later under the pending bill, we will have a Navy the replacement value of which will be \$5,000,000,000. But, as a matter of fact, the total amount of money we actually spent under the Vinson-Trammell Act was \$247,000,000. In 20 years, however, because this act authorized replacement of all obsolete vessels the entire Navy would have to be reconstructed and cost the amount named; in 40 years it would be \$8,000,000,000, and so forth.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Precisely. The Senator is coming to the information I want. We have spent in new construction \$247,000,000 under the Vinson-Trammell legislation. How much was authorized by the Vinson-Trammell Act?

Mr. WALSH. There was authorized all of that and a sufficient amount to build new vessels to bring us up to treaty strength. There was also an authorization for replacements which extended it indefinitely.

Mr. VANDENBERG. How many battleships?

Mr. WALSH. The Vinson-Trammell Act, like the pending bill, was a continuing authorization. It authorized the building of our Navy with appropriations of the necessary money for the essential capital ships, cruisers, submarines, and destroyers to reach the 5-5-3 ratio. It authorized the replacement of obsolete craft. Do I make myself clear?

Mr. VANDENBERG. Yes; but were there no estimates in dollars and cents as to what the Vinson-Trammell Act contemplated?

Mr. WALSH. So far as I know, there were no such estimates made. I suppose there was an estimate of the cost of the new vessels authorized. This amount was \$380,329,250.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Did it authorize any additional capital ships, battleships?

Mr. WALSH. It did not, but it authorized the replacement of capital ships as they became obsolete. I may add that in the treaties to which I have referred there were embodied agreements as to what should be considered an obsolete ship, and the limitations were phrased so that each country, when a battleship had been used for a given number of years, could, without the permission of the other and without violation of the treaty, proceed to build a replacement ship for the obsolete ship.

Let me add in that connection that, under the original treaty of 1930, the life of a capital ship, or the under-age period, which is the term now used, of a capital ship which was 20 years, of a cruiser 16 years, and of a submarine 13 years. Now, under a later arrangement with Great Britain, which is incorporated in the pending bill, the under-age period of ships is increased so that 26 years is the under-age period for capital ships. The agreed under-age is now as follows:

	Years
(a) Capital ships.....	26
(b) Aircraft carriers.....	20
(c) Cruisers, subcategories (a, heavy; b, light):	
If laid down before Jan. 1, 1920.....	16
If laid down after Dec. 31, 1919.....	20
(d) Light surface vessels, subcategory (c).....	16
(e) Submarines.....	13

Mr. VANDENBERG. Will the Senator bear with me further?

Mr. WALSH. I am glad to yield to the Senator.

Mr. VANDENBERG. This is the information I am trying to obtain: There must be a vast reservoir of unused authorizations upon which we have not as yet undertaken construction. Is not that correct?

Mr. WALSH. There is, for replacement of ships only. I will later refer to a table and give that information to the Senator in detail, if he will permit me. This bill promulgates the authorizations in the Vinson-Trammell Act and provides for a 23-percent increase in our Navy.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Let us personify it in respect to battleships. What would be the situation in respect to authorized battleship construction without the pending bill which the Senator is now presenting? In other words, how many authorized battleships have we not as yet undertaken to construct?

Mr. WALSH. The number is seven.

Mr. VANDENBERG. In other words, we could build seven additional battleships for which we have not as yet made any appropriation?

Mr. WALSH. Yes; to take the place of old ships.

Mr. VANDENBERG. All of them to take the place of old ships?

Mr. WALSH. Yes; of obsolete ships.

Mr. VANDENBERG. The obsolete ships are not decommissioned, however, as I understand?

Mr. WALSH. That is true. They need not be destroyed, but will probably not be kept on actual duty with the fleet.

Mr. VANDENBERG. But in terms of dollars and cents the Senator can give me no information as to either the prospectus of the Vinson-Trammell Act or the amount of authorized construction under it with respect to which no effort has been made to proceed?

Mr. WALSH. I can tell the Senator the amount of money that has actually been expended under the Vinson-Trammell Act, part of it being for replacements and part of it for new ships. I can inform the Senator as to the number of destroyers and the number of submarines that should be replaced and for which we have never appropriated money for under the Vinson-Trammell Act. I repeat, during the next 20 years we can replace all obsolete naval vessels under the Vinson-Trammell law.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Let me ask the Senator if this figure would seem to be correct, that the total cost of the ships now authorized but not yet begun exceeds \$650,000,000?

Mr. WALSH. That may be correct, if we replaced all our obsolete ships. In dealing with this question we should keep in mind that authorizations and appropriations are for two purposes, namely, replacement of old ships and the building of new ships.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President—

Mr. WALSH. I yield.

Mr. BORAH. I desire to ask a question. How many battleships would we have if we should complete the program without the aid of the provisions of the pending bill?

Mr. WALSH. We would have 15 under-age battleships and we might have a few that were over-age.

Mr. BORAH. We are building two battleships at the present time and two more are authorized. Is not that correct?

Mr. WALSH. They are to replace two ships which will soon become over-age.

Mr. BORAH. The replaced ships, however, are not decommissioned?

Mr. WALSH. No, sir; that is true, but the others are not as yet commissioned. It takes 3 or 4 years to build them.

Mr. BORAH. Can the Senator advise me, leaving out now the provisions of the pending bill, what would be the strength of our Navy in battleships without the enactment of the pending bill should we complete the present authorized program?

Mr. WALSH. We would have 15 under-age vessels and a considerable number of over-age vessels.

Mr. BORAH. Can the Senator advise me as to the number of over-age ships?

Mr. WALSH. There will be six or seven in the course of the next 4 years.

Mr. BORAH. So we would have more than 19 battleships?

Mr. WALSH. That is correct, but only 15 would be under-age.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator a further question?

Mr. WALSH. I yield.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Inasmuch as our construction facilities are necessarily limited, would it be possible to complete construction under the existing authorizations and still proceed with the new construction contemplated by the pending authorization short of 5 or 6 years to come?

Mr. WALSH. We will not have completed all the naval vessels for which we have appropriated money and which are now being constructed until 1942.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Without reference to the pending bill?

Mr. WALSH. Without reference to any more building. If we stopped right now, and did not spend another dollar, it would take that period of time in order to complete such naval craft as are now being constructed.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Does the Senator mean that under the authorization which we are now proposing to make, construction is not to begin until 1942?

Mr. WALSH. The authorization bill we now have before us contemplates a 10-year program of building. If this bill is enacted, it is expected that only about \$22,000,000 will be expended during the next fiscal year. Thereafter the amount of money which we shall probably be asked for each year for new construction, unless some unforeseen emergency arises, is \$110,000,000. It contemplates that the construction will spread over a period of 10 years. However, if the President and the Budget Bureau and the Congress agree to appropriate, for a given year, more money than is contemplated by the present program, they are at liberty to do so.

In my opinion, the net appropriation each year for replacements and for new vessels will not be greatly in excess of what we have been appropriating under the Vinson-Trammell law, which is in the neighborhood of \$150,000,000, for replacements and for new vessels. In my opinion this 10-year program, if put in operation, will require a yearly appropriation of \$110,000,000 for new construction, and I should say from \$50,000,000 to \$100,000,000 for replacements, because, of course, there will have to be more replacements as the number of our vessels increases.

Mr. VANDENBERG. If the Senator, in his good nature, will let me submit just one more question to him, I desire to tell him very frankly one of the fundamental things that bothers me, and I should like to have his comment on it. I have the deepest respect for the Senator's candor.

On January 21, 1938, the House of Representatives passed this year's naval appropriation bill, carrying nearly \$550,000,000, probably the largest peacetime bill that Congress ever passed; and the Senate has accepted it to all net effect. When Congress was asked on January 21 to put \$550,000,000 into the Navy this year, there was no suggestion that it was necessary even to use up the unconstructed existing authorizations under the Vinson-Trammell Act.

Mr. WALSH. The Senator is correct.

Mr. VANDENBERG. On January 21 the President and the Navy Department, assessing the national defense and our naval needs, recommended the enactment of a bill carrying \$550,000,000, and did not find on January 21 that it was necessary even to exhaust the existing appropriations in order to provide for the national security. Yet on January 28, 7 days later, the President's message indicated that it was not only necessary in the name of national security to complete the construction of all the unconstructed authorizations theretofore existing, but that it was also necessary to add another billion dollars of authorization.

Will the Senator tell me what happened between January 21 and January 28 to make that enormous difference in the picture of the national security?

Mr. WALSH. I cannot tell the Senator what happened during those 7 days, but I can tell the Senator what has been happening since December 31, 1936.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Oh, yes; and the President's Chicago speech acknowledged the existence of all the difficult situations in the name of which we are now asked to create this additional national defense. That was in October 1937. All of this mad armament race was under way last year, all of these terrifying developments were well understood, and the President identified them specifically in October 1937. But on January 21, 1938, it still was not necessary to build up the existing authorizations; yet 7 days later it was necessary to do that, and to add a billion dollars. I confess to the Senator that I cannot see the answer.

Mr. WALSH. I think I can give the Senator an answer as I understand the situation. Of course, I cannot presume to explain the Chicago speech, or what was in the President's mind. I was going to develop this matter without these questions if I had gone along chronologically in developing my remarks, although I think the questions are apropos. One thing happened on December 31, 1936. A momentous question presented itself to us as a Nation, and that question has been with us and with the President from that day to this hour and to this bill: "What kind of a naval program are we going to have—the United States of America? What are now our naval needs to protect our people?"

Now, there is no limitation on navies; and immediately upon the ending of limitations—we have the figures here—Great Britain began to expand tremendously her Navy. Japan began to expand her Navy. These things have been occurring since December 31, 1936. It was the duty of some official of the Government—the President or the head of the Navy Department—to tell us what we ought to do, or at least what the facts were, and to make recommendations to us. Can Senators conceive of anything worse happening in the line of bringing into disrepute our Navy or the present President if he had remained silent, and had not asked for this authorization, and 5 years from now an enemy should meet us at sea, and we should have to confess that we had failed in our responsibility and obligation of knowing what was going on in the world in neglecting naval preparedness? It was the duty of someone, somewhere, to call our attention to what happened on December 31, 1936, and what has been happening since that time, and the diminishing relative strength of our Navy as in comparison with other navies.

Let me say now that even after all these ships are authorized, from this day to the day the last ship is built we shall be below the 5-5-3 ratio. We are now below that ratio. The

only way in which we could possibly reach the 5-5-3 ratio would be through the immediate construction of practically all of these ships, which would be impossible. We have not the facilities to do it.

Mr. LUNDEEN. Mr. President—

Mr. WALSH. I yield to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. LUNDEEN. The Senator speaks of sinking ships as the result of the Washington Conference. I believe \$200,000,000 worth of ships were sunk, or thereabouts.

Mr. WALSH. The Senator is correct.

Mr. LUNDEEN. I believe one of them, costing \$40,000,000, and almost completed, the *Washington*, was taken out into the ocean and sunk. I wonder what kind of statesmanship that was. I am sure the Senator's committee would not O. K. that sort of thing. What kind of statesmanship was it when America, finding herself the leading power on the waters of the earth, listened to foreign diplomats and sank part of her fleet, and now we find ourselves discussing and debating about building a fleet, part of which is to replace vessels we sank because siren songs from across the waters were sung to our so-called statesmen here?

Mr. WALSH. I do not know what the motive was, but I know that I personally favor every effort that can be made by any official of any Government to bring about a limitation of naval armaments. I applaud every effort that is made anywhere at any time to bring that about, and in this bill there is still the hope that it may be done. There is an expression in this bill requesting it or inviting it, if it can be done; and let me say here—after all, we are in the family, and thinking about our national defense or welfare—I have no authority for saying it, no one has mentioned it to me, but I have a feeling that the passage of this bill may promote some activities among the nations in the direction of bringing about a limitation of naval armaments.

Mr. LUNDEEN. But the Senator would not approve of limitation by sinking our Navy?

Mr. WALSH. The Senator from Minnesota has called attention to an event which has been a source of criticism upon the part of the American people. I think the Senator from Minnesota is justified in making the comment he has made. Whether or not that was a wise act, I do think, somewhat in justification, that it was a gesture toward world peace. The air at that time was full of expressions of sentiment along the line of world peace. We were going to have a league of nations, a limitation of armament, and so on; peace was to dawn upon the world; and no nation was striving more strenuously than was our Nation to promote world peace.

Mr. LUNDEEN. If the Senator will permit me, I should like to say that at that time I strenuously opposed that policy, and I think I was right.

Mr. WALSH. Events have tended to show the correctness of the position then taken by the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. President, let me state just one thing, and then I shall be glad to answer all questions.

I said that on December 31, 1936, all treaties for the limitation of naval armaments expired. What is our naval program now? What should it be? Should we go back to the condition before the World War and have no program, but build up our Navy from year to year as we think it wise and proper to do so? That is one course. Should we abandon the theory and principle of maintaining anything more than a mere shell of a navy, having no relationship to the navies of other countries? Should we engage in a mad race to have the largest navy in the world? Or should we take the course which this bill points out, of saying to the world, "We propose to maintain the 5-5-3 ratio, and we propose a building program which will approach the 5-5-3 ratio. That is the position which the United States takes among the navies of the world?"

That is this bill. That is the issue here. Shall we try to maintain a 5-5-3-ratio navy, in view of what the other countries are doing in the line of building navies, or shall we abandon any naval program? Shall we drift along? Shall we wait until the enemy is at our gates, or what shall we do?

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President—

Mr. WALSH. I yield to the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. VANDENBERG. The Senator speaks about the necessity for a program. Of course, I see how there could be no challenge to a program, but I ask the Senator whether we have any assurance that even under the pending bill we have a program, because the program is changed stupendously within 3 weeks, since the bill passed the House. Is not that correct? Then we suddenly discover that we need 45,000-ton ships instead of 35,000-ton ships.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, I am pleased to reply to the Senator. There is not a material change in the bill between the bill as it passed the House and the bill now before us except in two particulars. The House provided for three battleships of 35,000 tons. Information that one country was building a 45,000-ton battleship led our naval experts and authorities to suggest before the Senate committee that we ought to give them the option of building 45,000-ton battleships instead of 35,000-ton ships, no more ships, only three, but the 45,000-ton ship will be more powerful. It will also be much more expensive than the 35,000-ton ship, and adds to the amount of the authorization in the bill. That is the first change. No more ships are provided for.

Will the ships be 45,000-ton or 35,000-ton? We cannot decide that question, we must leave it to the naval experts, that we will give them the authorization for the three ships, but that they will have to determine. We decided to give them enough for the 45,000-ton ship. That is the only change, and that is very important. Not a single additional combatant ship has been added to the House bill.

The other change relates to aircraft carriers. The House bill provided for two aircraft carriers of 15,000 tons each. The Senate committee bill proposes two aircraft carriers of 20,000 tons each. I again say that no larger number of aircraft carriers has been provided for—only two. The question of aircraft carriers has been one that has been given much study and thought, and we are somewhat in the experimental stage with this type of naval craft. We now have two aircraft carriers of 15,000 tons each, we have two of 20,000 tons each, and we have two of 33,000 tons, which were converted to aircraft carriers from battle cruisers. I had the privilege of seeing one of the larger aircraft carriers, which carries a hundred planes. I had the satisfaction of seeing one of the smaller aircraft carriers of 15,000 tons, which carries about 70 planes. To my mind, to the lay mind, there was a tremendous difference between the two types. I am speaking now from information I got personally. I learned from the officers of the Navy with whom I conferred that the 15,000-ton aircraft carrier was not altogether satisfactory, that the larger vessels were the better, in their judgment; and I think that is universally recognized in the Navy.

The committee finally accepted the recommendation of the naval officials that two 20,000-ton aircraft carriers could be built, if they chose to build them. We gave them the choice of building either 15,000-ton or 20,000-ton aircraft carriers.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WALSH. I yield.

Mr. VANDENBERG. If the Senator will let me take him back just a moment to the change from 35,000-ton battleships to 45,000-ton battleships, as I understood the Senator, the reason for the change was that some word had been received that some other nation was building 45,000-ton ships.

Mr. WALSH. Yes.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Suppose the week after this bill was enacted we should hear that some nation was building 50,000-ton ships. Would we then immediately have to proceed to build 50,000-ton ships?

Mr. WALSH. No.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Why not?

Mr. WALSH. Forty-five-thousand-ton battleships are as powerful ships as can be built at the present time. There is no advantage in building ships larger than about 45,000 tons. If a majority of the Senate want to provide for the 35,000-ton ships, they may do so. All that I can do, as chairman of the committee, is to take the advice and suggestions of the

experts of the country, just as the chief of a fire department in a city has to take advice as to what is the best way to cope with fires. I cannot substitute my judgment that a 35,000-ton battleship is as effective and as powerful and as valuable as a weapon of defense as a 45,000-ton ship.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I hope the Senator will not construe any of my questions as suggesting any criticism of his attitude.

Mr. WALSH. I understand that.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I know of no more patriotic Senator in this body, or one who is constantly more responsive to his duties, than the able Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. WALSH. I thank the Senator.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I am merely seeking from the Senator, in his official capacity as chairman of the Committee on Naval Affairs, some information to bear upon the maze in which I find myself when I try to discover any reason for the bill.

Mr. WALSH. For the bill itself?

Mr. VANDENBERG. Yes. If it is reasonable to jump from 35,000- to 45,000-ton ships in the course of 3 weeks, while the bill is traveling from the House to the Senate, because we hear that some nation is building 45,000-ton ships, then it is logical to look forward to jumping to 50,000-ton ships, if that is the next news we hear. I cannot contemplate how we are to have a program or how we can ever stabilize ourselves in reason if our program is constantly influenced by a relative construction that is reported to us from some foreign source.

Mr. WALSH. The Senator need not answer this question unless he chooses. Does the Senator think our present Navy is sufficient for our defense?

Mr. VANDENBERG. The Senator thinks the present Navy is of complete adequacy within the Vinson-Trammell authorization for any emergency we shall confront if we mind our own business and keep out of other people's wars.

Mr. WALSH. In view of the Senator's position, it is very clear that he should oppose the bill; but I feel that I must take the advice of the naval authorities of the country and favor this program.

Let me now say this about battleships: The ship-of-the-line—the battleship at the present time—ever has been and, as far as can be foreseen, ever will be the supreme embodiment of sea power. The battleship is the least vulnerable of any vessel against air or any other form of attack. It is the most formidable and hardest hitting. It is capable of withstanding maximum punishment from guns, torpedoes, mines, and bombs. No fleet can afford to lack them if they are contained in an enemy's fleet. As a reserve in power and as a rallying point for all other types of warship, the battleship is yet the backbone of sea power.

A fleet of which battleships are the basic element is the only naval force that can avoid being driven from the sea by enemy battleships.

Under no circumstances should the United States agree to abolish battleships until every country in the world has agreed to abolish this type and also to abolish submarines.

The main strength of our Navy that now rests in our battleships could, if battleships were abolished, be replaced only by a large number of heavy cruisers. Our defense would be stronger and better if we had battleships, even if other nations did not have this type.

If other nations build battleships larger than 35,000 tons it will be necessary for our Navy to possess ships in excess of 35,000 tons if it is to perform its vital function of meeting and defeating an enemy at sea.

Mr. LEWIS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Massachusetts yield?

Mr. WALSH. I yield to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. LEWIS. I beg to aid the Senator, the chairman of the Committee on Naval Affairs, and bring to the attention of the able Senator from Michigan a matter which I am sure has escaped him, in view of the great volume of investigation this question would require.

The Senator from Michigan appropriately asked the chairman of the Committee on Naval Affairs whether he knows and can explain why, after certain figures of authorization

had been given, the President subsequently, within 3 weeks, tendered another figure that was somewhat increased.

I take the liberty of inviting attention to the fact that on the floor of the Senate, at about the date of these differences, I assumed to sit in judgment and somewhat to criticize a class of citizens who had reflected on the Government of our Nation as an institution of extravagance and barbarity in seeking to construct a Navy.

Senators may recall that the eminent leader of the Progressive Party, the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE], assumed that I was referring to an eminent educator at that time, one known as Professor Beard.

I call to the attention of the Senate, and advise Senators now, that at that time, as the able Senator from Michigan will recollect, the Navy Department had submitted a confession that some of the vessels which they had theretofore depended on as strong enough for use were obsolete; that some along the line of the new suggestions which the chairman of the Naval Affairs Committee now brings to our attention as to other nations, were unfitted, and had to be changed, and I take the liberty to advise the Senator from Michigan that it was the opinion of us all, and I make bold to state it, that the President's addition, to which the Senator from Michigan appropriately refers, was because of the new information brought to the State Department, that the ships which previously were treated as being sufficiently adequate were either obsolete or in a condition needing such repair as calls for this increase, for which the Senator from Michigan asked the reason.

I take the liberty of bringing these matters to the attention of Senators as coming from the report of the Navy Department.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, I am pleased to have the helpful observations of the Senator from Illinois. Let me say that this program was not a 7-day program; that the naval authorities fully realized that with the ending of the treaties they had an obligation to their country to tell what was happening in the world and what was developing among other navies, and to put the issue up to us. It is now our responsibility.

Let us see whether the Senator from Michigan wants to stay in the position in which he puts himself. If we stop building under the Vinson-Trammell Act we will permit Great Britain to have 25 battleships, while we have 19; we will permit Japan to have 14; we will permit Japan, Italy, and Germany together to have 30; we will permit Italy and Germany together to have 16.

It is all well enough to talk about the Vinson-Trammell Act and it being sufficient to provide us with the necessary

naval defense, but we cannot settle this issue with mere comparison of the navies of other countries, before the expiration of the treaties on December 31, 1936, and our Navy under the Vinson-Trammell Act. An entire and complete new situation has been brought about, and I will now present to the Senate the latest table we have available as to what the present situation in the world is, as of March 15, 1938, with respect to battleships, aircraft, cruisers, destroyers, and submarines.

The United States has 17 battleships. Great Britain has 20. Japan has 10. This has no reference to what we know now that Great Britain is doing. Let me say we know accurately and definitely Great Britain's program. We do not know Japan's program. No one does, and no one can find out. No one can receive any direct information with respect thereto through any direct sources.

We now have 6 aircraft carriers. Great Britain has 11, or almost two to our one. Japan has 6.

We have 37 cruisers of both types, the heavier and the lighter. Great Britain has 57. We have 37 to their 57, and we are supposed to be on a 5-5 ratio with Great Britain. Japan has 28 vessels in the cruiser class.

The United States on March 15 had 84 destroyers. Japan has 85, and our ratio with Japan is supposed to be 5-3. Great Britain has 129, and our ratio with Great Britain is supposed to be 5-5.

Submarines. The United States has 38, Japan has 44, and Great Britain has 57. There is positive proof that we have not built up to the 5-5-3 ratio.

I wish to add that 10 years from now, after this program is completed, if it takes 10 years to complete it, we will then not have a 5-5-3 ratio, but we will be approaching it, but if the other two countries continue building as they are now building the United States will be far below a 5-5-3 ratio.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GILLETTE in the chair). Does the Senator from Massachusetts yield to the Senator from Idaho?

Mr. WALSH. I yield.

Mr. BORAH. Will the Senator from Massachusetts in connection with his speech place in the RECORD the figures for the navies of Japan, Germany, and Italy, so far as they are known to this Government? I do not ask the Senator to take the time to do it now.

Mr. WALSH. I shall be pleased to do it. The Senator will find these tables on pages 26, 28, and 29 of the committee report.

The tables are as follows:

Summary—Germany

[From information received up to Mar. 15, 1938]

Type	Built						Building and appro- priated for		Grand total	
	Under-age under 1936 London Treaty ¹		Over-age under 1936 London Treaty ¹		Total					
	Number	Approxi- mate tons	Number	Tons	Number	Approxi- mate tons	Number	Approxi- mate tons	Number	Approxi- mate tons
Capital ships.....	3	30,000	2	26,080	5	56,080	5	157,000	10	213,080
Aircraft carriers.....							2	38,500	2	38,500
Cruisers (a).....							3	30,000	3	30,000
Cruisers (b).....	6	35,400			6	35,400	4	34,000	10	69,400
Destroyers.....	22	25,850	5	3,387	27	29,237	12	20,616	39	49,853
Submarines.....	36	12,424			36	12,424	25	13,107	61	25,531
Total.....	67	103,674	7	29,467	74	133,141	51	293,223	125	426,364

Capital ships and destroyers, under-age and over-age, under Washington and 1936 London Treaties					
Under-age		Over-age		Total	
Number	Approximate tons	Number	Tons	Number	Approximate tons
3	30,000	2	26,080	5	56,080
22	25,850	5	3,387	27	29,237

Age limits for other types the same as in the 1936 London Treaty.

¹ Age as at the end of 1937.

Summary—Japan

[From information received up to Mar. 15, 1938]

Type	Built						Building and appropriated for ¹		Grand total ¹	
	Under age under 1936 London Treaty ¹		Over age under 1936 London Treaty ¹		Total					
	Number	Approximate tons	Number	Tons	Number	Approximate tons	Number	Approximate tons	Number	Approximate tons
Capital ships.....	10+(?)	² 301,400+(?)			10+(?)	² 301,400+(?)	(?)	(?)	10+(?)	² 301,400+(?)
Aircraft carriers.....	5+(?)	78,420+(?)			5+(?)	78,420+(?)	¹ 1+(?)	10,050+(?)	6+(?)	88,470+(?)
Cruisers (*).....	12+(?)	107,800+(?)			12+(?)	107,800+(?)	(?)	(?)	12+(?)	107,800+(?)
Cruisers (b).....	14+(?)	83,496+(?)	8	35,080	22+(?)	118,576+(?)	2+(?)	16,950+(?)	24+(?)	135,526+(?)
Destroyers.....	76+(?)	102,933+(?)	27	26,070	103+(?)	129,003+(?)	9+(?)	13,500+(?)	112+(?)	142,503+(?)
Submarines.....	41+(?)	59,512+(?)	16	14,236	57+(?)	73,748+(?)	3+(?)	4,750+(?)	60+(?)	78,498+(?)
Total.....	158+(?)	733,560+(?)	51	75,386	209+(?)	808,946+(?)	15+(?)	45,250+(?)	224+(?)	854,196+(?)

Capital ships and destroyers, under-age and over-age, under Washington and 1930 London Treaties

Type	Under-age		Over-age		Total	
	Number	Approximate tons	Number	Approximate tons	Number	Approximate tons
Capital ships.....	3+(?)	95,430+(?)	7	*205,970	10+(?)	301,400+(?)
Destroyers.....	73+(?)	100,623+(?)	30	28,380	103+(?)	129,003+(?)

Age limits for other types the same as in the 1936 London Treaty.

¹ Age as at the end of 1937.² Includes *Hiyei* (29,330 tons) which was converted to a training ship in accordance with the 1930 London Treaty, but is now reported being rearmed.³ Also aircraft carrier *Koryu*, 10,700 tons estimated (reported projected for laying down in 1938). Would be in 5-year replenishment program beginning Apr. 1, 1938.⁴ See footnote (2) above.

NOTE.—Above summary shows all information released to the public by Japan on ships in the above categories. It does not include any ships under the 5-year replenishment program which commenced Apr. 1, 1937. This program is estimated to include approximately: 3 capital ships (reported to be 46,000 tons each, with 16-inch guns); 5 aircraft carriers, subcategory (*) (without flight deck); 43 destroyers; 7 cruisers (b) (6.1-inch guns); 8 submarines; total, 66 ships.

Summary—Italy

[From information received up to Mar. 15, 1938]

Type	Built						Building and appropriated for ¹		Grand total	
	Under-age under 1936 London Treaty ¹		Over-age under 1936 London Treaty ¹		Total					
	Number	Approximate tons	Number	Tons	Number	Approximate tons	Number	Approximate tons	Number	Approximate tons
Capital ships.....	4	90,354			4	90,354	4	140,000	8	230,354
Cruisers (*).....	7	70,000	1	9,232	8	79,232			8	79,232
Cruisers (b).....	12	74,488	3	9,332	15	83,820			15	83,820
Destroyers.....	83	80,690	33	25,897	106	106,587	44	56,724	150	163,311
Submarines.....	75	57,787	8	3,235	83	61,022	² 27+	23,434	110+	84,456+
Total.....	171	373,319	45	47,696	216	421,015	75+	220,158+	291+	641,173+

Capital ships and destroyers, under-age and over-age, under Washington and 1930 London Treaties

Type	Under-age		Over-age		Total	
	Number	Approximate tons	Number	Tons	Number	Approximate tons
Capital ships.....			4	90,354	4	90,354
Destroyers.....	66	74,795	40	31,792	106	106,587

Age limits for other types the same as in the 1936 London Treaty.

¹ Age as at the end of 1937.² NOTE.—New program includes the following: They are included under "Building and appropriated for" column; 2 capital ships (35,000 tons each) totaling 70,000 tons; 12 destroyers (estimated 2,000 tons each totaling 24,000 tons; "numerous" submarines.³ Numerous.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, I have seen that table before, but I am wondering if that table is based upon what the Senator deems accurate information?

Mr. WALSH. All the tables are furnished us by the Navy Department and are based upon the latest reliable information. We receive them from no other source. Not one of these tables has been received from any other source than the Navy.

Mr. LUNDEEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WALSH. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. LUNDEEN. The Senator is very good-natured with respect to yielding. I thought perhaps the Senator preferred to make his statement now and to yield to questions later. But it occurs to me that if America had not been so free in financing the nations which we are supposed to be

building against, and if we had not poured billions of dollars into Europe, with a portion of those very billions of dollars being turned into battleships and instruments of war, we would not now be engaged in this long drawn-out debate.

I have in mind, for instance, that if we take into consideration the amount of rehabilitation loans and other loans which we made to European nations, with interest over a period of 62 years, the amount owed us will be about \$25,000,000,000. Then, under the terms of the Washington Conference, we sank some of our ships. All this financing was being done while we have had millions of starving people in this country. I do not approve the kind of statesmanship that is shown by such actions. I am sure the Senator does not approve of such statesmanship.

Mr. WALSH. I am in sympathy with the Senator's observations.

Mr. President, why do we have a navy at all? What is the purpose of a navy? A navy—I am afraid this will be shocking to some ears—is for the prevention of war. That is the first reason for having a navy. The second reason for having an adequate and a strong navy is that in the event of an enemy attacking us we can shorten the war, and we can reduce to a minimum the loss of life and the loss of our natural resources. Let us keep that in mind. In the event of war a strong navy which is capable of overpowering the enemy can shorten the war and can reduce to the lowest degree the loss of life and the loss of property.

There are many ramifications to this subject, but I do not think it is necessary for me to prolong discussion at this time. Probably other questions will arise from time to time.

I should like now briefly to analyze the bill and show just what it contains and just what its provisions are.

Mr. NYE. Mr. President, before the Senator proceeds may I propound a single question to him?

Mr. WALSH. Certainly.

Mr. NYE. Did I understand the Senator to say that the Navy or the authorities were without the ability to know definitely and accurately what the Japanese plans of building at the present time were?

Mr. WALSH. The testimony before our committee given by Admiral Leahy was that the Navy Department is unable to get accurate testimony as to the plans of Japan in the direction of naval expansion. That she is expanding and building up her Navy we know, but the extent and degree we do not know.

Mr. NYE. Is there accurate knowledge that Japan is building these 45,000-ton battleships?

Mr. WALSH. I am not satisfied that information was given us that there was accurate knowledge of it.

Mr. NYE. There is not then definite, accurate knowledge that Japan is planning such construction?

Mr. WALSH. That is my impression. The best reliable information is that Japan began the construction of three 46,000-ton battleships carrying 16-inch guns about April 1, 1937. Japan has refused to officially deny or affirm these reports. I think it a safe assumption to say that she would deny these reports if they were not true.

Let me say in this connection that the Navy Department would prefer to build 35,000-ton battleships. It does not want to go into the building of 45,000-ton battleships unless some possible enemy builds battleships of that tonnage. If left to its own desires and wishes, if left to think of the kind of a navy it would like to build, without considering the navy of any other country, I am convinced that 35,000-ton battleships would be satisfactory to the Navy Department. As the Senator knows, the size of battleships is left optional in the bill.

Mr. NYE. I understand. So far as our planning now is concerned, as respects these 45,000-ton battleships, our plans are based wholly upon rumor or gossip, or guessing as to what Japan might be doing or planning to do.

Mr. WALSH. Some information is from press reports. Some is information that perhaps I ought not to mention on the floor of the Senate, but I may say that the Senator knows

that every government has in every other government certain official staffs who have duties to give information to their country in reference to matters of this kind.

Mr. NYE. Everyone knows also from the record that has been made in recent years where a great deal of this thought is generated, where it has its birth, and that it has no foundation whatsoever in fact in many instances. We find those who would profit out of a larger shipbuilding program always eager to convince us that other nations are planning some heretofore unthought of thing, and then we are driven into an action that at once requires other nations to keep up with us, and I am satisfied that if we do authorize, as we are asked to do now, the construction of 45,000-ton battleships, we will only be handing down a challenge that will be quickly accepted perhaps by countries that have no thought at the present time of any such construction. To that extent we will be responsible for a tremendous armament race.

Mr. WALSH. Let me say that so far as I am concerned, I do not care whether the Senate reduces the tonnage to 35,000, 25,000, or 15,000. After conferring with the representatives of the Navy, after hearing their testimony, and getting their views, and after seeing the picture of what is going on in the world, I feel it is my duty to present their viewpoint to the Senate, and let the Senate take the responsibility.

Mr. LUNDEEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WALSH. I want to make my position clear. I do not want to be in the position 10 years from now that the course I took as chairman of the Naval Affairs Committee in opposing a 45,000-ton battleship may represent the difference between defeat and victory if naval conflict happens, which God forbid.

Mr. NYE. On the other hand, the Senator would not want to be responsible 10 years from now for a race in the larger construction, for which we might easily be responsible.

Mr. WALSH. I agree with the Senator. But I do not think we are engaging in a race when we confine ourselves to a navy even less than the 5-5-3 ratio, a navy less than other governments said we ought to have as a matter of security for ourselves, and less than our own officers said we needed in view of the size of other navies.

Mr. NYE. Of course, the understanding respecting the 5-5-3 ratio is now a thing of the past. It is no longer recognized.

Mr. WALSH. It is a formula which the experts of all the great powers determined was a relationship of navies which was more likely to promote peace, and less likely to give undue advantage to any navy in the event of war. Do I state my position clearly?

The committee opinion on the 5-5-3 ratio as stated in the report is as follows:

The committee is of the opinion that if in each class of ships we maintain not less than a 5-5 ratio with Great Britain, and a 5-3 ratio with Japan, we will make war unlikely for us, will insure the well-being and prosperity of our people, and will shorten any war we may be forced into.

Mr. NYE. I think the Senator does. But when the 5-5-3 ratio was agreed upon, some group of minds had to be the parties to it. By what right would an American insist today that we need as much naval preparedness as Great Britain needs, for example, with her possessions flung all over the face of the earth and our interests as concentrated as they are? By what right do we insist that we need as much naval preparedness as Great Britain needs?

Mr. WALSH. That is a question which would require some time to answer. I shall attempt to answer it briefly.

Mr. NYE. I am only trying to make the point that there might be disagreement as to what was a fair ratio.

Mr. WALSH. No other country in the world has as extensive a seacoast as we have.

Mr. LUNDEEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WALSH. I am trying to answer the Senator's question.

No other country in the world has the obligation which we have under what is known as the Monroe Doctrine. So

long as we have the Philippine Islands, we have as great an obligation as Great Britain in providing proper defense for the people in possessions or colonies which we assume to protect and guard.

No other country in the world has Alaska, with its tremendous seacoast, to protect and defend. No other country except China is within a few hundred miles of one of the countries of the world which has given evidence of great militaristic ambitions. I do not think we realize how close the coast of Alaska is to one of the great naval and military powers of the world.

Great Britain has extensive trade routes, reaching into every part of the world, which it is necessary for her to keep open in order that she may survive in case of attack by an enemy. We, too, have trade routes. It is estimated by our experts that unless we are able to keep open certain trade routes the United States of America could not maintain itself for more than 2 years without being defeated by a powerful enemy. We must have rubber. We cannot store rubber, because it decays. Can Senators conceive of a situation in time of war in which it would be absolutely impossible to obtain tires for our automobiles, trucks, and commercial vehicles of all kinds and descriptions?

We cannot build battleships in time of war unless we keep the trade routes open to bring in manganese. We cannot make munitions in time of war unless we keep the trade routes open to bring in certain essential raw materials. So, in answer to the Senator, in very many respects we are in exactly the same situation as Great Britain.

Furthermore, I may say that it is estimated that the navy of any enemy which could get within 1,500 miles of either shore, Pacific or Atlantic, could do great havoc to our cities along the ocean fronts. We have the most valuable resources in the world contained in the cities along the Atlantic and the Pacific seacoasts. Without a navy sufficiently strong to keep a potential enemy 1,500 miles away, the damage which could be done would be tremendous.

I am sure we all entertain great sympathy for the people of England who live in constant dread of war and unceasing fear of the possibility of air attack upon her great cities. But while we are farther away from potential enemies than Great Britain, we have cities with millions of people, where the resources are of stupendous value; and it would be one of the functions of an adequate navy to protect us against the possibility of an attack through the air.

The committee's analysis of aviation is contained on page 6 of the report. It is as follows:

AVIATION

Naval aviation's function is to operate as an arm of the fleet and to assist local naval defense forces in the patrol of coastal zones and the protection of shipping therein. Naval aviation, in operating as an arm of the fleet, will support the fleet in all its tasks, including scouting, engagements with the enemy, and protection of commerce. The endeavors of naval aviation are to increase the efficiency and striking power of our fleet.

Aircraft, without the assistance of surface vessels, cannot deny an enemy control of the sea. A sufficiently powerful fleet could do it without aircraft assistance. It could do it better with aircraft assistance. The roles cannot be interchanged as long as weather varies and aircraft must land.

Ship-based aircraft, and all types of naval aircraft, including patrol planes, can provide very valuable assistance to naval vessels in protecting our essential trade routes, and shore-based aircraft can be of some assistance in protecting coastal shipping; but no air force can, in itself, adequately protect our shipping. Only ship-based aircraft can assist in this at great distances from our coasts and possessions, where our essential trade routes could, without the protection of our fleet, be disrupted and destroyed quite as effectively as, and more easily than, at points close at hand.

Air forces cannot protect our industrial centers and cities from aircraft attack from beyond the seas if an enemy has control of the sea and maintains battleships and aircraft carriers upon the seas. Shore-based aircraft cannot take the place of a mobile fleet.

In the event of war shore-based aircraft could not bring the war to a successful conclusion. This has been illustrated with increasing positiveness throughout the war in Spain. If we became involved in a war with an overseas enemy, the usefulness of shore-based aircraft would have to remain secondary to the primary role of the Navy, that of protecting our commerce and preventing the enemy from reaching a position from which he could effectively

attack in any manner our country and our possessions. Shore-based aircraft alone, even were they able to present an inconceivably—and impossibly—impregnable defense, would still be only defending. This can never defeat any enemy. He could still take all manner of extremely harmful action other than direct attack and the war could be brought to a conclusion only by our agreement of terms satisfactory to the enemy and not by any means of our own that would be limited to hoping that he would, as it were, impale himself on our aircraft.

In the opinion of the committee nothing would be more conducive to aggression on the part of an unscrupulous and reasonably intelligent enemy outside this hemisphere than the knowledge that he could wage war upon this country while exposed only to the negligible injury of the passive defense to which we should be committed by primary reliance on shore-based aircraft.

The committee is convinced of the very great importance of aircraft in our scheme of national defense. No force, ashore or afloat, can afford under any circumstances to be without ample aircraft support. In the committee's opinion aircraft alone cannot fill the role of primary defense of this country. The Navy, our first line of defense, may not always be available for defense against raids at every time and place. The necessity for sound secondary defense is obvious. There is therefore great need for a strong shore-based aircraft arm in our coastal defense.

I am afraid I have imperfectly answered the Senator, but, in a general way, I have given the picture presented to us.

Mr. NYE. I thank the Senator. However, he makes the point that an enemy navy which could get within 1,500 miles of either shore would be a real danger to our cities along the Atlantic and the Pacific coasts.

Mr. WALSH. It could do much damage.

Mr. NYE. Is not the danger wholly dependent upon the degree of defense we have upon land, and upon our defense with aircraft, so far as the Army is ready to afford it?

Mr. WALSH. In a measure that is true.

Mr. NYE. Is not defense against that sort of attack much more largely a question of military rather than naval preparedness?

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WALSH. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. CONNALLY. Is it not much better to prevent the enemy from reaching New York or the coastal points, by destroying him at sea? Then we would not need such a big army at home. Is not that the answer?

Mr. WALSH. The Senator has made the answer for me.

Mr. NYE. The Senator makes the point of sympathy with Great Britain in her danger from attack. Does Great Britain's Navy mean anything to her against such an attack from across the channel?

Mr. WALSH. It would if we went to war with her.

Mr. NYE. If we went to war with Great Britain?

Mr. WALSH. Yes; or if Japan did. If Germany, or Italy, or one of the nearby countries went to war with England, the same situation would not apply.

Mr. NYE. In other words, in such event England's dependence would be upon land forces, rather than upon naval craft.

Mr. GERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WALSH. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. GERRY. Does not the history of the World War very clearly show that England's Navy is her main reliance in keeping the food line open? While she defends with her own airplanes from attack by air, she also keeps open her sea lanes with her Navy, and keeps food coming into England. It was the English Navy which saved England in the World War.

Mr. WALSH. That is true; but I think the Senator from South Dakota is correct in calling attention to the fact that England has a somewhat greater problem than we have so far as naval defense is concerned. I may add that, in my opinion, Great Britain would not be Great Britain today if it were not for her Navy. If I may digress, the history of the world shows that overpopulated countries seek to find places to colonize their excess population. Such countries look for the best country they can find which they can conquer. They would rather take a rich and prosperous country, if they thought there was a possibility of conquering it, than to take Ethiopia or China. If during the past England had not had a powerful navy which the whole world

has always feared, in my opinion, she would never have been able to maintain her security.

Mr. LUNDEEN. Mr. President—

Mr. WALSH. I yield to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. LUNDEEN. I understand the Senator is advocating the policy of the Navy; but, in reality, so far as I can see, it comes down to the question of our foreign policy. The size of the Navy we should have, whether a great navy or a supernavy, or whatever it may be called, depends on the foreign policy of our State Department, as I understand it.

If we are to have gunboats up the Chinese rivers, and maintain fleets in oriental waters, if we are going to send fleets into European waters, if we are going to police the world, I think the Navy is right in maintaining that we should have a supernavy. If we are going to do those things, we will need all the navy that is proposed and more, too. However, I have to be convinced that that is the policy we should pursue. I do not believe that it is the policy of the founders and the fathers of this country.

If the Senator will bear with me a moment further, let me say that recently I voted for a \$50,000,000 appropriation, or thereabouts, for coast defenses, and I was very glad to do so. There was recently presented a bill which carried nearly \$500,000,000 for the Army, and we were glad to support it. I do not believe any Senator opposed the \$550,000,000 regular appropriation for an increased navy, which is \$100,000,000 more than it was last year. We are going a long way in the matter of coast defenses, a greater army and a greater navy, and then we find, superimposed upon it all, this proposal which I think is due to the foreign policy of this country. I am wondering if I am correct in that contention.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, I have never been able to find a definition of foreign policy satisfactory to myself. I know it is a very imperfect definition, but, personally, it is my view that the foreign policy of this country depends upon the state of mind of the President and the State Department at any given time under a given state of facts. If any Senator can improve upon that suggestion, I should like to have him do it. The issuing of a note or the writing of a letter to a foreign country written in a wrong tone and couched in inappropriate language may destroy all the foreign policy that we have theretofore declared.

I do not desire to argue that the enactment of this bill is going to insure peace to us and prevent war. You and I, Mr. President, cannot control the foreign policy of some future President or of some future Secretary of State. We have got to express the hope that they will comply with what is almost the universal sentiment of the American people, that we keep out of the foreign affairs of other nations and have no alliances with them; that we mind our own business; that we pursue a strict course of neutrality when other countries become involved in trouble; and that we do everything that is humanly possible to keep out of war when war is raging in any part of the world.

However, in considering this bill we should keep in mind the words which are found in the title of the bill and which express the purposes of the bill. The bill fixes the authorized "composition of the United States Navy" as of today and as we see it in the future. That is all. The ships provided for by the bill may never be constructed; they never ought to be constructed if there should be a change in the next 5 or 10 years in the situation in the world so far as the prospects of war are concerned and if the present mad rush for the building and expanding of navies and the maintenance of large armies should cease. But is there anything wrong or improper or unsound, in view of the fact that the naval armament limitation treaties have ended, and no such treaties are in force, in view of the fact that Great Britain is building and expanding her Navy rapidly, in view of the fact that we have every reason to believe that Japan is doing the same thing, to say here and now to the world that the authorized composition of our Navy is going to be somewhat less than the 5-5-3 ratio and not in excess of it. That

is the whole question at issue; and I think we ought to keep to that issue.

I will refer to a table showing what will be the composition of our Navy as soon as we shall have completed this program. I now refer to Admiral Leahy's testimony.

On the assumption that reported Japanese and other foreign programs are correct, the relative ratios of approximate tons of the various types of warships, over age and under age, reported built, building, appropriated for, or projected, including tonnage authorized in this bill will be—

Understand, the figures include all that we say we may do in the next 10 years or may authorize to be done, but does not include what other nations are going to do within the next 10 years. The figures I am about to quote relate only to what we know they have done up to this time. So it may be seen the figures are imperfect in that they do not give us a picture of the future. Let us take the ratio first.

Great Britain, 5—

The reference is still to the 5-5-3 ratio—the United States 4.9.

In other words, if Great Britain should not build another battleship in the next 10 years, assuming our program stretches over 10 years as is contemplated, and we build all that are provided for in the pending bill in 10 years, it will take more than 10 years to bring about that ratio, for it requires 4 years to build, and then on the basis of present figures we will have a 4.9 ratio as against Great Britain's 5.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President—

Mr. WALSH. I will refer to the figures affecting Japan, and then will be glad to yield to the Senator. I am calling attention to what Admiral Leahy said. On the assumption that the Japanese program as reported is correct, Japan will have 2.9 ratio as against our 4.9 ratio without Japan ever building any more ships. France will have 1.6; Italy, 1.6; Germany, 1.4; Union of Soviet Social Republics, 1.2.

I now yield to the Senator from Nebraska and will read the other figures in a moment.

Mr. NORRIS. I should like to have some information from the Senator about these ratios. As I understand, the Senator says if we complete the program which is now contemplated, at the end of it, without Great Britain, for instance, building another ship, we will be one-tenth of 1 percent below Great Britain?

Mr. WALSH. That is correct.

Mr. NORRIS. Then, have we heretofore been misinformed as to our standing as compared with that of Great Britain?

Mr. WALSH. We have not been misinformed, but most of us have not realized that our Navy was inferior to Great Britain's.

Mr. NORRIS. Instead of our Navy being equal to that of Great Britain it has been away below that of Great Britain?

Mr. WALSH. Our Navy has never been on an equality with Great Britain's Navy since the day the Washington Treaty was signed.

Mr. NORRIS. What is the reason we have had misinformation that has led us all astray on that point?

Mr. WALSH. I do not believe we have been misinformed. We have had authority to build up to a strength equal to Great Britain, but we have never made sufficient appropriations to reach this strength. The Senator will recall the action taken by President Coolidge in 1926 when he sought another limitation conference and had sent delegates to Geneva for that purpose.

There was a complete failure and our representatives returned home. It was discovered that during the period of time between the Washington conference and 1927 the other countries had been building and expanding their navies in all other categories except battleships, the limitation agreement being confined to the one category.

Mr. NORRIS. And we had not done so?

Mr. WALSH. We had done nothing; we did not expand our Navy between the time of the Washington Treaty and the time of the Coolidge recommendation for the building of

18 cruisers so as to show the other nations that we were not going to let our Navy become obsolete.

Mr. NORRIS. At the time of the Washington Conference, Japan's navy was on a ratio of 3 to 5 in comparison with ours, as I understand.

Mr. WALSH. Yes; I understand so.

Mr. NORRIS. Japan has been building all the time after that treaty. Was that in violation of the treaty?

Mr. WALSH. No, Mr. President. For 3 years after the Washington Treaty the United States did not start the construction of any naval vessels in any of those categories not included in the treaty. In 1925 we built 1 combatant vessel; in 1926, 1; in 1927, 3; in 1928, 6; in 1929, none; and in 1930, 4; a total of 15 vessels in 8 years. During these 8 years Japan began the construction of 21 combatant vessels in 1922, 10 in 1923, 16 in 1924, 11 in 1925, 13 in 1926, 9 in 1927, 7 in 1928, 10 in 1929, 6 in 1930, a total of 103 combatant vessels.

Mr. NORRIS. Then how does it happen, if we complete this great program and Japan does no more building, that we shall be only a little ahead of her?

Mr. WALSH. The Washington Treaty was the most over-rated treaty that ever was promulgated. All that that treaty did was put a limitation upon capital ships and aircraft carriers. There were no limitations upon anything else. Each nation could build all the cruisers, destroyers, and submarines it wanted.

Mr. NORRIS. Did we fool anybody besides ourselves? Were the people of Great Britain deceived? Were the people of Japan deceived by it, as we were?

Mr. WALSH. If they did not read the treaty and did not note the events that followed, they were deceived.

Mr. LUNDEEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. WALSH. Yes; or would the Senator be willing to have me go ahead with the table?

Mr. LUNDEEN. Certainly.

Mr. WALSH. Let me finish this table, because, after all, it gives us a picture of what the situation will be, assuming that we carry out this authorization, and on the assumption that the navies of Great Britain and Japan remain stationary.

I shall not read the detailed ratios; but the totals will be as follows:

Great Britain, 5. Some one of the nations must have a ratio of 5 in order to determine the relationship of the other two.

United States, 4.6.

I desire to have it understood just as emphatically as possible that after this \$1,100,000,000 is spent, requiring at least 10 years, if Great Britain does not build an additional single naval vessel within the next 10 years, we shall have a navy inferior to hers; and we know, or have every reason to believe, that she will build more naval vessels in the meantime.

Mr. NORRIS. Of course it is foolish to assume that she will not build anything during the next 10 years.

Mr. WALSH. Of course; and it is only in the light of these comparisons that Senators can appreciate—shall I say it—how meager is the request in this bill. Terrible as it is, shocking as it is, to think that it is necessary to spend \$1,100,000,000 for naval craft in this time of distress and trouble and sorrow and grief and unemployment, there are certain things that a government cannot escape doing. A city may give up everything else—its schools, its health department, and so on—but it must maintain a police force and a fire department. The Federal Government may give up everything else, but it cannot give up the lives of its people and its property. It must have a navy! and it is only a question of what kind of a navy and what size navy we must have. The Navy is our police force. It is our fire department. It is our protection. It is our life.

There is no better example of that in the world than the way in which Great Britain, because of her navy, has sur-

vived in spite of all the enemies she has had, and the condition today of poor China, without a navy.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President—

Mr. WALSH. I yield to the Senator from Texas.

Mr. CONNALLY. The Senator says we must have a navy. We ought to have one that is at least not just big enough to get licked.

Mr. WALSH. That is very true.

Mr. NYE. Mr. President—

Mr. WALSH. May I finish this statement? Then I shall be glad to yield to the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. NYE. Certainly.

Mr. WALSH. If we build all the vessels authorized in this bill we shall have a navy which will be 4.6 in proportion to Great Britain's 5. Japan will have a navy of 3.2. If we build all the vessels authorized in this bill, and Japan builds no more than we know, or think we know by reports, that she intends to build, she will have a ratio of 3.2, and we shall have a ratio of 4.6, showing that she is ahead of us on the 5-to-3 ratio. The ratio of France—I do not know that it is of consequence—will be 1.8. The ratio of Italy will be 1.7.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, before the Senator leaves Japan's quota, let me ask him a question. He says her ratio will be 3.2. That means, does it, that even then her Navy will be larger than ours?

Mr. WALSH. Japan's Navy today is on a ratio of 3.2 to Great Britain's 5. After 10 years the ratio of our Navy will be 4.6, after we have spent all the money authorized in this bill, if we spend it.

Mr. NORRIS. If Japan does not build anything in the meantime, we shall have a navy a little bit larger than hers?

Mr. WALSH. That is it.

Mr. NORRIS. Instead of having a larger navy than Japan all these years, as we believed to be the case, does the Senator mean to say that we have, in fact, had a smaller navy and a less efficient navy than Japan has had?

Mr. WALSH. I cannot say that in tonnage, or in the number of naval craft, our Navy has ever been smaller than that of Japan; but the 5-3 ratio between Japan and this country was based upon the fact that since Japan had no colonies, no extensive trade routes, no extensive coast line, no Monroe Doctrine, and no outside possessions like Hawaii and the Philippines, which we then had, if she was going to be a peaceful nation she did not need a ratio larger than 3 to 5 to us and to Great Britain.

Mr. LUNDEEN. Mr. President—

Mr. WALSH. I yield to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. LUNDEEN. I should like to say to the Senator that I believe we now have an invincible Navy, and a Navy sufficient to protect America.

Mr. WALSH. May I interrupt the Senator for a moment?

Mr. LUNDEEN. Yes, indeed.

Mr. WALSH. For the sake of informing Senators now present on the things we discussed in the committee, does the Senator from Minnesota think that if we had to engage in war with one nation on the Atlantic seacoast and another one on the Pacific seacoast, we should have a sufficient Navy?

Mr. LUNDEEN. I cannot conceive of that happening. In fact, I am willing to state for the Record, and leave it there, that we are not going to be attacked in this generation by any one nation or a group of nations. We shall not be able to get into the next world war unless we go hunting for it on Chinese rivers or oriental or European waters.

I should like to say to the Senator that of course I am merely attacking the supernavy policy which the Senator so ably presents. If we build this supernavy, are we sure that we shall be able to elevate our guns to a sufficient elevation to hit an enemy ship; or will Great Britain tell us that we may not elevate the guns on our ships sufficiently to get within range of an enemy?

I remember that not long ago there was some agreement about that matter; and I hotly resented the idea that any foreign country should tell us whether or not we might elevate our guns. I do not like that sort of a policy. I do not think it is an American policy. Has that been dropped?

Mr. WALSH. Yes; the technical question as to the elevation of guns was settled in our favor some 8 or 10 years ago.

Mr. LUNDEEN. I am glad we are becoming more American.

Mr. WALSH. The Senator from Minnesota states that he has the positive assurance, which satisfies him, that we are not going to have any war. If there is any man in the Senate or in the country who can assure himself and the American people that there will not be war within 25 years, we not only ought not to pass this bill but we ought to scrap the present Navy and stop naval appropriations; but what assurance of that sort have we? I said on another occasion, and I now repeat, that war is like the angel of death. No human being knows when death is coming, and no nation knows when war is coming, unless it be a war declared by a nation which prepares itself for war and gets ready to declare war.

Who would have dreamed in 1914 that we would be involved in the World War? Yet we were; and let me call attention to testimony before our committee which will impress the Senator from Minnesota, I am sure, and my learned and distinguished friend from North Dakota (Mr. NYE). Testimony was given before our committee quoting Lloyd George as saying that if, upon the outbreak of the World War in 1914, the United States had proceeded to build up a strong and powerful navy, we never would have been in the World War. That is what Lloyd George said; and why? Because Germany and Great Britain, both of which imposed upon our rights on the sea, would have been afraid to do so, and neither Germany nor Great Britain would have wanted us to be on the opposite side from them in the war.

I am very much impressed with that statement—that had we, at the outbreak of the World War, built up the powerful Navy which we had at the end of the war, we would have avoided a tremendous expenditure, we would have saved the lives of many, many human beings that were lost in the war, and in all probability we would have entirely escaped the war.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, alongside of that, let us lay down the statement by André Tardieu, of France, that the moment we made our first Anglo-French loan he knew we were going to be in the war.

Mr. WALSH. Of course, that was afterward. That had nothing to do with the matter of preparedness.

Mr. VANDENBERG. No; but it has something to do with whether or not the angel of death is quite so sudden and unanticipatable as the Senator has indicated.

Mr. WALSH. God knows, it was sudden to the American people. I do not know who, on the inside, had knowledge of it. It was sudden to the American people. It was sudden to the Congress to think they were voting for war. It was sudden to the boys who marched out and went across the sea. It could not have been more sudden. What went on behind the scenes leading up to it I do not know; but I do not think anybody deliberately led us into the war.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Oh, no.

Mr. WALSH. I think there may have been misjudgment of facts, or perhaps not the necessity of the severe action that we felt obliged to take from time to time, that step by step led us into the war.

Mr. LUNDEEN. Mr. President—

Mr. WALSH. I yield to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. LUNDEEN. Perhaps if we had quoted a little more from George Washington and Thomas Jefferson and Andrew Jackson and Abraham Lincoln and not so much from Lloyd George and other present-day foreign statesmen we should not have gotten into the World War.

Mr. WALSH. Of course, Lloyd George did not say what I have quoted until after the war.

Mr. LUNDEEN. We are not saying, and should not say, that there cannot be war. Of course there can be war. I agree with the Senator there; but my point is that we are not going to be attacked. The powerful nations of Europe are watching each other across very thin lines. If they engage in a war they will be exhausted after the war, and will not be able to attack us within a generation, no matter who wins. We are bound to get jittery, however; and we shall have to have some foreign statesmen come over here, and come on the floor of the Senate and the floor of the House, and present their pleas for men and money.

I am glad the Senator opened up the subject of the World War, although we cannot go into that at this moment, because the Senator is making his own statement; but certainly we shall have to hunt now for Senators and Representatives who voted for entrance into the World War who will stand up and say that it could not have been avoided.

Mr. WALSH. I should like to make this statement, that no one could be familiar with the affairs of our Navy, and have intimate knowledge of the problems of our Navy, without realizing that we had at least one potential enemy in the world, one enemy which, in my opinion, if it had a navy of sufficient size, would be a source of great anxiety and worry to this country. I need say no more. I think Senators can infer from that statement what I have in mind.

Mr. President, there are very few Americans, the number is infinitesimally small and negligible, who do not favor a navy. That is the first proposition. What kind of a navy? They say an adequate navy; but they all have their own judgment as to what is an adequate navy. Where are we to go to find out what is an adequate navy and what is not? To whom are we to go? Are we to go to the munition makers? No. To the engineers? No. To the students of international affairs? No. We must go to the men who are charged every day in the year with knowing what is going on in the world, with knowing the activities of other navies, and the needs of our Navy. We finally come down to the proposition that we must rely upon our naval experts as to what is an adequate navy.

I choose to call a navy adequate—and I do not know a better definition—to be one which in time of peace the whole world respects as a strong and powerful and efficient navy, and a navy which in time of war every potential enemy in war will fear. That is an adequate navy. Anything less than that is like a fire department which may be efficient for 9 out of 10 conflagrations in the community, but when the tenth comes, it is inefficient and useless.

Mr. LUNDEEN. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GILLETTE in the chair). Does the Senator from Massachusetts yield to the Senator from Minnesota?

Mr. WALSH. I yield.

Mr. LUNDEEN. I am sure that the able and distinguished Senator from Massachusetts will tell us that our Navy today is just the kind of a navy he describes, that it is a powerful, splendid, invincible navy, one which the world respects, and one upon which we can depend. I know of no war in which we have been engaged where our Navy did not give a good account of itself.

Mr. WALSH. Our Navy in combatant vessels and in the efficient personnel is creditable.

Mr. LUNDEEN. I am glad to hear the Senator say that.

Mr. WALSH. Many of our ships are old and obsolete. This bill provides for the replacement of old ships as well as the building of new vessels. But our Navy today, if engaged in a conflict with a combination of nations or with Great Britain—and I am almost inclined to include Japan, but I will not, in making this statement—is, in my opinion, insufficient to guarantee the destruction of an enemy navy.

Let me explain that. I refer to combatant vessels and efficient personnel. We cannot measure the strength of a navy, its power, its usefulness, its effectiveness, without going beyond combatant vessels. We must have, next, auxiliary vessels. In auxiliary vessels we are tremendously deficient.

Our Navy has asked us to build 48 auxiliary vessels, and in the pending bill all we have given it is 26.

What do I mean by auxiliary vessels? I refer to the repair vessels, which go out to sea with the fleet, and when bombs strike a cruiser, or battleship, or some other craft, there is an auxiliary ship or there are several auxiliary ships to do the repair work in order to get the combatant vessels back so that they can continue the battle. There are hospital ships, to take off the dying, the wounded, and the injured. We have not enough oil tankers to supply the oil so that the combat vessels will not have to come back to shore, perhaps 1,500 miles.

There are various types of auxiliary ships. In that respect we are tremendously deficient. I am developing this so as to show that while in combatant vessels we might be able to make a creditable showing, it does not follow, when we measure all the factors we have to take into consideration, that we have an adequate navy.

What is the next factor? The next is the merchant marine. What kind of a merchant marine have we to assist us in time of war? Who has forgotten the terrible story of outrageous and stupendous expense to which we were put in order to transport in foreign vessels our own soldiers to the fields of France because we had no merchant marine? Great Britain has a powerful merchant marine. The vessels in her merchant marine are so constructed that they can be quickly put to war purposes. We have none. Japan has an efficient merchant marine in comparison with ours.

The point I am trying to make is that, being deficient in a merchant marine, having practically none at all; being deficient in auxiliary vessels; we cannot be very boastful about what our Navy could do in the event a powerful enemy or a combination of enemies should beset us. If a combination of enemies attacked us, we could not hope for success with our Navy, as a matter of fact.

Mr. LUNDEEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. WALSH. I yield.

Mr. LUNDEEN. I am, of course, a layman in this matter.

Mr. WALSH. I spent a long time in learning some of these things, as I have stated today, and I do not think I know them any too well yet.

Mr. LUNDEEN. I have not served as a member of the Committee on Naval Affairs of the Senate, although I am a member of the Military Affairs Committee. I wonder just how much credence we are to give to the reported statement of Admiral Sims that the safest place for dreadnaughts and superwarships in the next war will be as far up the Mississippi River as we can get them. I am wondering what credence we should give to that.

Mr. WALSH. I do not know just what he meant by that. Did he mean that our Navy was so weak that it would be better for it to go and hide, as the German Navy had to do?

Mr. LUNDEEN. No. I do not suggest this or even attempt to imply that I have expert knowledge, but the reports given out have been that the hidden dangers, the dangers from submarines, and aircraft, and sea sleds, and whatever they may be, these rapid craft which fire torpedoes, and that sort of thing, are multiplied so much now that when we build a battleship we will have to spend a great deal of money in order to protect that battleship. For instance, I recall that it was stated in the debate in the House of Representatives, that whenever we spend \$52,000,000 for a battleship we have to spend another \$52,000,000 to protect it, so that it will not be sunk after it is built.

Mr. WALSH. Of course, all those things are matters of expert knowledge and information. We have had a variety of opinions presented to us, not exactly along the line the Senator quotes, although I have heard the expression of the late Admiral Sims.

Mr. LUNDEEN. I am wondering whether it is correct or not.

Mr. WALSH. The naval experts say to us that no Navy is of any value that cannot go out and fight the enemy

when it is coming to us, that our Navy cannot hide up the Mississippi River, or up the Hudson River, or anywhere else, without surrendering. The World War proved that a defense navy must be a navy which, when an enemy is approaching, is capable of going out and meeting it and of annihilating it, and that a navy that is merely sufficient to patrol the shore, like a policeman patrolling his beat, and even the policeman has to be augmented in time of danger with an increased number of men, is inadequate. A navy when threatened with attack has to be capable of going forward and opening up the attack. Otherwise, the experts say, a war would be prolonged indefinitely. They say that it is necessary, in order to shorten a war, to have a navy of such size and strength as to make an attack succeed. Otherwise, the vessels will stay around the harbors and around the shore, the war will go on and on and on, with the cost piling up, more battleships and more planes being built all during the period of the war, trade routes being cut off, and the supply of necessities for carrying on the war being diminished.

Mr. LUNDEEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WALSH. I yield to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. LUNDEEN. As I understand from the Senator's statement, so far as combat is concerned, we are all set; we have a combat navy that will account for itself on the high seas.

Mr. WALSH. No, Mr. President, I did not say it is all set. I used the word "creditable," I think. I do not want to say anything against our Navy. I think it is a creditable navy. I do not know a better word to use in connection with it. We have a reasonable number of combatant vessels. We have them fairly well proportioned in the different categories. We have a fine personnel. I cannot speak too highly of the personnel of our Navy. I think from that standpoint we have the best Navy in the world. The young men are given fine training, and in the maneuvers of our fleet show remarkable efficiency, if we can judge by the reports that are made by their superior officers. All the things that the Senator speaks of as implications arising from Admiral Sims' remarks are tried out by the Navy. All those things are experimented with.

The different units have conflicts with each other. They check up on each other. It is determined which side won in the conflict. They are all the time trying to determine the value of each one of these craft, the submarine, the cruiser, the destroyer, their importance and the positions they should take in time of conflict. All these matters are subjects of daily study. That is why we give the Navy the money in times of peace, that the Navy may be studying these problems, so in the event of difficulties it will be able to take care of itself.

Our battleships will be used just as the British and American battleships were used in the World War. The battleships of the British Grand Fleet, which included some of the battleships of the United States Fleet, from their position at Scapa Flow and elsewhere in the British Isles, blockaded all of the surface vessels of the German Navy in their own ports. The trade routes of the world were thus kept open for allied commerce and military communications.

Mr. LUNDEEN. Mr. President, I am in favor of supplying the Navy with funds with which to experiment. When the Senator comes to that portion of the bill, I hope he will explain why we are dropping out the \$3,000,000 appropriation for lighter-than-air craft, which have always been considered of value in war. We seem to have gotten ourselves tangled up in connection with the sale of helium in the last few days, if the Senator will permit me to mention that. First, we had hearings in the Committee on Military Affairs with respect to the matter of permitting a foreign country to obtain helium from us. We permitted that country to get just enough for commercial purposes, but not enough so it could be used for war purposes. Then some officer of the Government did not permit it to be sent over to the other country, but now I understand we are obliged to send it over

there because we have suddenly discovered that the lighter-than-air craft is of no value in war.

I am wondering if some layman might not know these things perhaps as well as some naval experts who are contradicting each other every 10 minutes.

I wish to ask the able Senator about another matter. Three weeks ago the House and the naval experts, as I understand, thought that 35,000-ton ships were ample, but now we are perhaps to have 45,000-ton ships. The experts do not seem to know what they want. It seems to me we had better go along the established standards we have tried out and seem to have found sufficient.

I wish to say just one further word. I am sure the Senator from Massachusetts agrees with me that our personnel and our Navy are fully effective with respect to anything which concerns American territorial waters. If we draw a line from the Bering Sea to the Hawaiian Islands and thence to the Panama Canal, and then from the Panama Canal to the northeast coast of Maine, and consider those waters to be our territorial waters, I believe we have an invincible fleet within those waters. But if we are to send that fleet out to guard Standard Oil tankers in Chinese rivers—and, by the way, we are getting an indemnity for the tankers that were sunk—and we send them all over the world, into oriental or European waters, and that is why I reverted to the foreign policy, then I should be inclined to go with the Senator from Massachusetts and vote for greater appropriations or authorizations.

Mr. WALSH. Our only difference, of course, is with respect to the size of the Navy.

Mr. LUNDEEN. Yes. We may belt the globe, as it were, with American vessels, we may police the earth, we may tell various governments what they are to do—and every day I read in the press that we are lecturing foreign countries upon what they should do—but it seems we are not able to take care of our own unemployment situation and take care of our own front yard. If the Senator will permit me, I wish to add one word, and that is that with our great unemployment and the poverty and destitution in our own great land, we are developing destructive forces within our country that are far more dangerous, in my opinion, than any possible, vague, foggy attack that might come from foreign countries which are too busy watching each other and planning for the next war against one another, and when that war is fought they will be too exhausted to attack us.

Mr. President, I think the Senator will agree with me that we should talk more about unemployment and social security problems in the United States than to be everlastingly debating warships and fleets, and planning to send Americans to every war that is going to be fought the world over. I think that is contrary to the fixed foreign policy of this country. I think we have a fixed foreign policy of this country and that policy is to trade with all and to be friends with all, and not mix in their quarrels.

I thank the Senator.

Mr. WALSH. The Senator has covered so many subjects, properly and appropriately, that it is difficult to answer them all. I wish to reply to one comment that he made with reference to our Navy in Chinese waters. I hope the Senator will not blame the Navy. The Navy never enters a foreign port or goes near a foreign country without directions from the State Department. The Navy has troubles enough of its own without entering foreign territory.

Mr. LUNDEEN. It may be the fault of the State Department.

Mr. WALSH. It can be blamed, perhaps, for inefficiency, if there is any inefficiency, but it certainly cannot be blamed for being directed by the Commander in Chief to go to a given spot in the world where there may be war. It is its duty to obey orders. Of course, there is a defense which the State Department would make to the presence of the Navy in Chinese waters, namely, the treaty obligations,

which, as the Senator knows, exist as to the patrolling, with other countries, of that water.

The other subjects mentioned by the Senator from Minnesota are matters of great and vital interest to our people, and should be weighed in connection with whether we should not be spending more money and giving more time to those problems than to the problem that happens to be before us now, which I am obligated to present to the Congress.

Mr. President, I wish to have printed in the RECORD at the end of my remarks the table from which I read before I was interrupted, and also some other tables and quotations from the committee's report giving information to the Senate.

(The matters referred to appear at the conclusion of Mr. WALSH's remarks.)

Mr. WALSH. I would now like to state briefly and concisely what is contained in this bill.

First, the bill, I repeat, is an authorization bill merely, and nothing authorized in this bill can ever be converted into naval craft without the approval of the President of the United States and a vote of the Congress appropriating the necessary money. The bill increases the number and tonnage allowances of combatant vessels in the Navy by approximately 23 percent.

Second, the bill authorizes the President to build up the Navy to the new authorized strength, including replacement of vessels as they become over-age.

Third, the bill authorizes the President to acquire or construct additional naval airplanes, including spare parts and equipment, so as to increase the number of useful planes from 2,050 to a total of not less than 3,000.

The reason for that is that the number of airplanes belonging to the Navy has some relation to the number of combatant vessels that it has. At the time of the passage of the Vinson-Trammell Act the Navy considered 2,050 airplanes a sufficient unit to accompany the other units of the Navy. It now fixes the amount, in view of the authorization in this bill, at 3,000.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WALSH. I yield.

Mr. BORAH. While the bill authorizes the President to do so and so, the Congress would have to act in the matter of appropriations.

Mr. WALSH. Yes, surely. I mentioned that. It is very important and very essential, and a very wise provision, that authorization does not mean appropriation, and that there must be separate action when it comes to the matter of appropriation.

Fourth, the bill authorizes the construction of 26 auxiliary vessels, 3 destroyer tenders, 2 submarine tenders, 3 large seaplane tenders, 7 small seaplane tenders, 1 repair ship, 4 oil tankers, 1 mine layer, 3 mine sweepers, and 2 fleet tugs.

I call attention to section 4 of the bill.

I wish to repeat with great emphasis and call attention to the woeful inadequacy of our Navy medical equipment. We have one hospital ship, an almost broken down, useless hospital ship. Think of having only one such ship in a conflict. I only speak of that as an example.

Oil tankers are very essential. Without them the fleet has to go back to shore every time it needs oil. The House limited the request of the Navy in that respect.

The Naval Affairs Committee of the Senate requested the Navy to supply it with a list of such auxiliary vessels as the Department deemed immediately necessary. We have substituted for the provision in the House bill the auxiliary vessels which the Navy Department considers somewhat preferable to those named in the House bill. We have increased the number by four; but because the vessels which we have selected would cost less than the auxiliary vessels provided for in the House bill, the amendment reduces the authorization by \$30,000,000. So that while there is an increase in the number of auxiliary vessels, because we have provided more of the less expensive auxiliary vessels, the particular item involves a saving of \$30,000,000.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WALSH. I yield.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Does the Senator's statement regarding oil tankers take into consideration the auxiliary oil tankers now being contracted for by the Maritime Commission?

Mr. WALSH. I am informed by the expert that the tankers in question are to be used by the Navy in peacetimes. The oil tankers to which the Senator refers are to be taken over in wartimes.

The next provision in the bill—

Mr. LUNDEEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WALSH. I yield.

Mr. LUNDEEN. Before the Senator takes up the next provision, I should like to say to the Senator that so far as I am concerned I should like to go along with him on the matter of the auxiliary vessels. I think many of them are needed. However, I object to these wandering warships, which meddle and muddle everywhere, perhaps under orders of the State Department. I do not blame the officers. We are ready to vote for whatever auxiliary vessels we need.

Mr. WALSH. The bill authorizes the appropriation of funds necessary to carry out the purposes of the act, including such sums as may be necessary to provide the essential equipment and facilities at navy yards for building any ship or ships heretofore or herein authorized.

The bill authorizes an appropriation of \$15,000,000 to be expended at the discretion of the President for the purpose of experimenting with light surface craft.

That item needs some explanation. We have merely reiterated one provision in the House bill. We have a serious problem in the defense of shores and harbors against attack from submarines which escape the fleet, or pass the fleet at sea. Vessels of a type known as patrol vessels will be built. They are in the experimental stage. They are small, fast vessels which, it is believed, would afford a valuable harbor defense. The authorization is for that purpose.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WALSH. I yield.

Mr. BORAH. Coming back to the question of authorization, if the President cannot go ahead and commit the country to the building of ships, what does the authorization amount to?

Mr. WALSH. It does not amount to anything. It is simply a piece of paper. In the absence of the Senator I called attention to certain language in the first section of the bill which says:

The authorized composition of the United States Navy in under-age vessels is hereby increased by the following tonnages.

That language is a statement to the world of what we contemplate at this moment will be the composition of our Navy within the next 10 years.

Mr. BORAH. Is it the view of the Senator that the President could not, under the phrase with reference to authorization, commit us to any building program in advance of appropriation?

Mr. WALSH. There is no doubt about that. I will say to the Senator that the President should not be permitted to do so.

The bill brings the construction of the vessels herein authorized under the terms and conditions of the act of March 27, 1934, as amended.

The bill defines the term "under-age", and states that this term shall be construed in accordance with the terms of the treaty signed at London, March 25, 1936.

I shall request at the conclusion of my remarks that a table of under-age vessels under the treaty referred to be inserted in the Record.

The bill states that the United States would welcome and support an international conference for naval limitations, and in the event of an international treaty for further limitation of naval armaments to which the United States

is signatory, the President is authorized to suspend naval construction, except that such suspension shall not apply to vessels and aircraft actually under construction.

The bill directs the Secretary of the Navy to appoint a board consisting of not less than five officers to investigate and report on the need, for the purposes of national defense, for the establishment of additional submarine, destroyer, mine, and naval air bases on the coasts of the United States, its Territories, and possessions.

The bill directs the Navy Department to construct on the Pacific coast of the United States such vessels as the President may determine to be necessary in order to maintain shipyard facilities upon the Pacific coast necessary and adequate to meet the requirements of national defense.

The shipbuilding and airplane procurement programs will probably be spread over a period of 5 years or more.

The estimated additional cost over a period of years to carry out the provisions of the bill is as follows:

46 combatant vessels.....	\$811,095,000
26 auxiliary vessels.....	216,451,000
950 airplanes.....	106,000,000
Additional equipment and facilities at navy yards (House committee's estimate).....	8,000,000
Expenditure for experimental purposes.....	15,000,000
Total.....	1,156,546,000

Mr. President, I do not think it is necessary for me to speak further at this time.

Mr. NYE. Does the Senator plan to speak further in support of the bill?

Mr. WALSH. If any questions are asked, or any features of the bill need further explanation in the opinion of any Senator, I shall be glad to speak.

Mr. NYE. The Senator has put in an arduous afternoon, and I realize that he may well have good reason to be tired at this time, but I had hoped that he might choose to discuss our naval policy. Does he plan to do so?

Mr. WALSH. I can answer the Senator now.

The question of adopting a naval policy was taken up in the House, and a declaration of policy was prepared, which was rejected on the floor of the House. The Committee on Naval Affairs of the Senate gave much consideration to the question, and decided not to make an announcement of a naval policy.

Personally I think it is impossible to declare a naval policy. The Navy Department itself from time to time has issued what it calls a naval policy. I think the first declaration of naval policy was in 1916, and the last was in 1933. The declaration, in my opinion, was nothing more nor less than a set of instructions for the guidance of the Navy. There seems to be nothing in it which to my mind indicates any restrictions or limitations upon the activities of the Navy.

So far as a national policy is concerned, I confess that I have given much thought to the matter, as have the members of the committee. None of us knows just what to declare in the way of a national policy. Perhaps the Senator was absent when I volunteered a definition of my own.

Mr. NYE. I heard the Senator's definition.

Mr. WALSH. My definition is very imperfect; but in the last analysis, the naval policy is what the Commander in Chief says and does under a given state of facts or in a given situation. Of course, if Congress should define what the President may and may not do, I suppose the President could be impeached if he sent the Navy more than 150 miles from the shore.

However, it is my opinion, and I believe the opinion of all the members of the Committee on Naval Affairs, that our efforts in that direction lead us up against a stone wall. In my opinion it is impossible satisfactorily to define a naval policy. If I were personally defining a naval policy—which would be only the beginning, and which would lead into a thousand avenues of increase—I should say the Navy exists to keep us out of war, and that we should maintain the Navy at sufficient strength to overcome any potential enemy in the event of war.

That definition is a statement of policy in a very few words. I am sure the distinguished Senator who is now interrogating me would not even want to agree to that statement. If he did, he would have to accept the bill, which the Navy Department thinks is possibly sufficient to keep us out of war.

But how shall we declare a policy? If the Senator has any suggestions, I should be pleased to hear them. How shall we define a national policy? Is not the national policy continually changing? What is our national policy today toward Italy? Who can define what we are to do with respect to recognition of the conquest of Ethiopia? What is our national policy toward Japan and China? Perhaps we could get together and define our policy with relation to those two countries; but we should have to define a different policy for every other country in the world.

It just could not be done, in my opinion, much as we would have liked to work out a policy. Particularly is that true of myself, because I am opposed to an aggressive navy. I do not want aggression; I do not want a navy that is going around with a chip on its shoulder; I do not want a State Department or a President that is looking for trouble, that is not alert to keep us out of trouble, that is not for peace, that is not willing to compromise and compromise and compromise rather than to lead us into the hell which is war. But how is the policy going to be defined? In what way are we going to handcuff the Navy or the State Department so as to be able to define it?

We have simply got to trust to the integrity, the patriotism, the ability, and the genius of the President of the United States and the check which the Congress has if he declares or attempts to declare war which in our opinion is not justified. I do not know that I have given the Senator an adequate answer, but I have expressed my personal views in reference to those two policies.

Mr. NYE. I thank the Senator. Let me further ask: Were there any discussions at all before the committee relating to policy in connection with the consideration of bills such as that now pending before the Senate?

Mr. WALSH. We talked about that question; we discussed it at different times. We examined the document which the Navy Department itself has which is said to evidence its policy. It is larger than this bill; there are more words in it than this bill contains. My interpretation of it was that it was very good—in fact, excellent—and there was nothing to criticize about it, but that it was made up more or less of rules and regulations for the guidance of the Navy itself. It seemed to me to be designed so that a young man entering the Navy reading this policy would get a conception of the Navy he would not get if he did not read it—as to the purpose of the Navy, its activities, the duties that the Navy was to perform, and so forth.

Mr. NYE. Is it fair to ask—

Mr. WALSH. Anything is fair in war.

Mr. NYE. To ask what was the origination of this expansion program in the Navy? Was it originated in the Navy itself?

Mr. WALSH. The information before the committee was that it was originated by the Navy itself.

Mr. NYE. It was so initiated?

Mr. WALSH. Yes. Admiral Leahy—and his testimony is very interesting, by the way, although some of it was somewhat confidential—said he himself approached the President; that he felt it was his duty, as Chief of Naval Operations, to inform the President of the naval races that were taking place in the world, of the fact that the United States was gradually and steadily becoming a less and less powerful naval factor in the world; and that the 5-5-3 ratio or any semblance of approach to it was fast disappearing, and that some action should be taken. I said to him—and I remember definitely the question I asked him—"Were you actuated in presenting the situation to the President by a desire to perform your full obligation and duty as the head of the United States Navy by informing the President and the Congress what the situation was, and did you feel

that in doing this you had relieved yourself of criticism in years to come for failure to perform your duty in the event that you allowed this situation to pass without calling public attention to it?" He said, "That was exactly my motive." I want to make clear that the program was not formed in 1 day or in 1 hour. I understand there were several conferences; but it originated in the Navy and evidently they worked out this 20-percent increase proportion.

Mr. NYE. Was there any evidence before the committee that any part of this program was undertaken in cooperation with other powers?

Mr. WALSH. When Admiral Leahy was before us some of the questions were in executive session, but I think the Senate is entitled to know this. I wrote out a series of questions which I will be glad to submit to the Senate; I prepared in advance of the hearing probably a hundred questions which I sent to Admiral Leahy and a similar number to the Secretary of the Navy covering every phase of the question. One of the very first questions I asked him when he appeared before the committee was, "Has there been any consultation, any communication, any suggestion of any kind in any shape, form, or manner, in reference to this proposal with any other country?" To that he replied emphatically, "No." I asked him about the incident that was discussed in the other House about the visit of a naval officer to Great Britain, because, like the Senator from North Dakota himself, I was desirous of not being a party to any movement to increase our Navy through any understanding with any other country or to have our Navy linked in any way, shape, or form with any other country. I do not know whether the Senator has read the record in the House. If he has read it, he will remember, I think, that two other suggestions of a possible unity of interest upon the part of Great Britain and ourselves were made.

I asked him about them. I asked him what was the occasion of the visit of the naval officer to Great Britain sometime in January of this year. It will be recalled that that fact was given publicity, and the suggestion was made that it was to negotiate or to become a party to some understanding with Great Britain. He told me that it was even stated that the naval officer crossed the Atlantic and went to England under an assumed name. Admiral Leahy said that was not the fact; that it was false. He said the presence of the naval officer in London was known and understood, and that he went there solely to consult with reference to the provisions of the London Treaty of 1936. It will be recalled that we made a treaty in 1936 in London in reference to certain technical provisions of naval building, and the naval officer went over solely to discuss them with the naval authorities of Great Britain. His presence was known in London, and there was no secret about it at all. He did discuss with the British naval authorities technical matters, and there was a determination upon the interpretation of some of the technical features of that treaty.

I asked Admiral Leahy about the presence of our two cruisers at Singapore. He replied that the two cruisers had gone to New Zealand upon invitation to participate in some celebration in New Zealand and that the officers of the vessels, as I understood, suggested they be permitted to stop at Singapore on the way back; that he took up the suggestion with the State Department, that consent was given and that they made the visit to Singapore simply, in part, at least, to break the trip and in part to visit Singapore; and he added that he was pleased because it gave—this perhaps is going beyond the record—the naval officers a chance to learn something about Singapore and its defenses which they would not have otherwise known.

Mr. NYE. Am I to understand that there was not an invitation extended to our Navy to participate in the demonstration at Singapore?

Mr. WALSH. I asked him about that, and he said, "No, sir."

Mr. NYE. That there was no invitation?

Mr. WALSH. I asked him that very question, and he said "No." He was very frank about it. I am convinced that, so far as we can believe a human being, the suggestion as

to any understanding is not founded on fact. Of course, we knew nothing about the State Department or negotiations that may have taken place in the State Department in reference to any of these subjects.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President—

Mr. WALSH. I yield to the Senator from Idaho.

Mr. BORAH. The questions to which the Senator has referred were propounded to whom?

Mr. WALSH. To Admiral Leahy.

Mr. BORAH. I am not, of course, prepared to challenge the veracity of Admiral Leahy or anyone else, and what I am about to suggest is in no sense an intimation along that line—

Mr. WALSH. I understand.

Mr. BORAH. But Winston Churchill, the ex-Chancellor of the Exchequer, said in the debate in the House of Commons after the Austria incident, that they, the English, had an excellent relationship with the United States. The press quoted him as using the word "agreement" and that the United States would not permit her Navy to fall below a certain ratio or standard.

Mr. WALSH. We will admit, I think, that Admiral Leahy may not know anything about that.

Mr. BORAH. But it is a most extraordinary thing that a man with the standing of Mr. Churchill and a man of his well-known independence should make a statement of that kind, unless there was something upon which to base it. If it was without warrant, it was without warrant, but I wonder how Mr. Churchill was misled.

Mr. WALSH. I, of course, can say only that it is possible, it is conceivable, that just what he said is true; but Admiral Leahy would not necessarily know it. I think we all agree to that, but I have no reason to think that either the State Department or the President has any understanding with Great Britain along the lines suggested.

Mr. BORAH. I thought I had Mr. Churchill's statement with me. I find that I have not. I may not have quoted it exactly, but certainly I have quoted it in substance.

Mr. WALSH. I suppose any Senator is at liberty to ask the Secretary of State for his statement in reference to that matter. Here is the answer he made on February 8, 1938:

FEBRUARY 8, 1938.

The Honorable KEY PITTMAN,
Chairman, Committee on Foreign Relations,
United States Senate.

MY DEAR SENATOR PITTMAN: My attention has been called to Senate Resolution No. 229, introduced by Senator JOHNSON of California on January 5 (calendar day, February 7), 1938, and ordered to lie on the table.

Under the terms of the proposed resolution the Secretary of State is requested, if it be not incompatible with the public interest, to advise the Senate in response to three inquiries.

For your information, and for such information as you may desire to make thereof, I desire to state to you very definitely that in response to point (a), which reads, "whether or not any alliance, agreement, or understanding exists or is contemplated with Great Britain relating to war or the possibility of war," the answer is "No"; in response to point (b), which reads, "whether or not there is any understanding or agreement, express or implied, for the use of the Navy of the United States in conjunction with any other nation," the answer is "No"; with regard to point (c), which reads, "whether or not there is any understanding or agreement, express or implied, with any nation that the United States Navy, or any part of it, should police or patrol or be transferred to any particular waters or any particular ocean," the answer is "No."

Sincerely yours,

CORDELL HULL.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President—

Mr. WALSH. I yield to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. NORRIS. I desire to ask the Senator something in relation to the naval policy he has been discussing and the difficulty of determining it. I think I appreciate the difficulty.

Does not the Senator think that one of the main items in the difficulty, or one of the main things that make outlining a policy difficult—

Mr. WALSH. Will the Senator let me interrupt him to read what the House committee declared as its policy? It

might help the Senator in his question. This is what the House committee reported, but it was struck out on the floor of the House. I thought reading it might help the Senator from Nebraska to develop the question he is about to ask:

It is declared to be the fundamental naval policy of the United States to maintain a navy in sufficient strength to guarantee our national security, not for aggression but to guard the continental United States by affording naval protection to the coast line in both oceans at one and the same time; to protect the Panama Canal, Alaska, Hawaii, and our insular possessions; to protect our commerce and citizens abroad—

See how sweeping that is. Who is able to describe a naval policy that will enable us "to protect our commerce and citizens abroad"? It shows the difficulty involved in drawing up anything of the kind—

to insure our national integrity—

What do we mean by "national integrity"?—
and to support our national policies.

What are "our national policies"? I am reading this only for the purpose of showing the Senator the difficulties involved.

Let me read further:

It is further declared to be the policy of the United States that an adequate naval defense means not only the protection of the Canal Zone, Alaska, Hawaii, and our insular possessions, but also a defense that will keep any potential enemy many hundreds of miles away from our continental limits.

The United States looks with apprehension and disfavor upon the general increase in naval building throughout the world, but it realizes that no single nation can reduce its naval armament without jeopardizing its national security, except by common agreement.

Mr. NORRIS. What is the Senator reading? Is that the report of the House committee or the bill itself?

Mr. WALSH. That is an actual section of the bill which was considered by the House, but was stricken from the bill on the floor of the House. I read it to show the Senator the difficulty involved, to show that we have a fight over every clause in the bill, with motions to restrict it and enlarge it and modify it; so we abandoned the idea of stating a naval policy.

I started out wanting a naval policy. I made up my mind that I was going to have one in this bill.

Mr. NORRIS. But the Senator could not get any?

Mr. WALSH. I could not get anywhere with it.

Mr. NORRIS. Now, I desire to ask the Senator if the matter as to which I am about to inquire is not one of the great difficulties making it practically impossible to establish a naval policy.

A few years ago, within our recollection, there was an honor existing between nations that was respected by every civilized nation, and that was carried to the limit. That is all changed now, as I see the matter. There are now several great nations in the world which, it seems to me, are disregarding a policy which a few years ago was recognized and respected by every nation on earth. But when Italy attacked Ethiopia—a weak, unarmed nation—without any cause, without any reason; when Japan took portions of China, and now is undertaking to take larger portions of China, without giving any reason, without any declaration of war, without any pretense of a right to do so that had been recognized by the nations of the world up to that time; when that was followed by Germany taking Austria without notice, without declaring war, and without any reason; what are respectable, honorable nations to feel that they are going to be called upon to meet, and how can they be expected to adopt a policy that will be just and will apply to all nations, if there are other nations—and there are, I think—which still respect their national and international obligations?

The policy that would fit a set of outlaw nations would have to be entirely different from a policy that would apply to nations of honor and self-respect which had some conception of the rights of humanity and innocent, unarmed people.

Mr. WALSH. The Senator from Nebraska has very concisely and directly and ably presented the difficulties involved in fixing a naval policy.

Mr. NORRIS. That question, it seems to me, arises in drawing up a naval bill. What shall be our attitude?

Will not this be conceded? Does not the Senator concede that the reason why we have been immune from attack, while Ethiopia and China and Austria have not been immune, is because we have a navy and an army of some size that can defend us and can prevent such a thing taking place? If we were not so situated, would not some of the outlaw nations rather take our country than to take Ethiopia, for example?

Mr. WALSH. They most certainly would, because we have more to give them.

Mr. NORRIS. Yes; there is more for them to get here.

Mr. WALSH. A selfish, despotic nation which is out for gain and money and pillage will take the best country it can get that is unarmed.

Mr. NORRIS. Absolutely; and the only reason why they have not taken us so far is because they think we probably are too powerful. That is the only reason why they have not undertaken to take England.

Mr. WALSH. All the history of the world confirms what the Senator says—that the weak and unprotected are the victims of the avaricious-minded rulers of the world.

Mr. LUNDEEN and Mr. NYE addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LEWIS in the chair). To whom does the Senator from Massachusetts yield?

Mr. WALSH. To the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. LUNDEEN. Mr. President, with the permission of the Senator from Massachusetts, I should like to inquire of the distinguished Senator from Nebraska if there is any difference between Italy taking Ethiopia and Great Britain taking the Boer Republic.

Mr. NORRIS. Yes; I think there is a great difference. However, as I look at the matter, the action of Great Britain cannot be used as an excuse for Italy taking Ethiopia. If Italy should kill our women and children, and destroy our property, and take possession of our country, would the fact that Great Britain took the Boer Republic be an excuse for her doing so?

Mr. LUNDEEN. Not an excuse—with the permission of the Senator from Massachusetts. But what is the difference?

Mr. NORRIS. If there is not any difference we ought not to object to it if we did not object in the other case.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. WALSH. I yield.

Mr. CONNALLY. In line with what the Senator from Nebraska said might have been our situation had we not been reasonably well prepared, is it not true that all that kept Napoleon from conquering England was the British Navy?

Mr. WALSH. History confirms that statement.

Mr. CONNALLY. The British Navy destroyed the French fleet, and thus kept Napoleon from invading England.

Mr. WALSH. I am thoroughly convinced that a navy that is respected the world over in time of peace, and that other countries fear to have combat with, is our greatest security and protection.

Mr. NYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Massachusetts yield to the Senator from North Dakota?

Mr. WALSH. I yield; but I ask the Senator from North Dakota to permit me to be brief in my answer, so that I may yield the floor.

Mr. NYE. Certainly.

A moment ago the Senator read from what purported to be a portion of the bill as it was reported to the House by the House committee.

Mr. WALSH. Yes.

Mr. NYE. Were the lines which undertook to define naval policy a part of the bill at the time of its original introduction?

Mr. WALSH. No. I think what I read was an attempt upon the part of the Members of the House committee to draft a naval policy. It was not part of the original bill.

Mr. NYE. It was not, then, an effort on the part of the naval authorities themselves to define a naval policy?

Mr. WALSH. I personally do not think so. I think the members of the House Committee on Naval Affairs themselves tried to make a definition. I do not believe they were furnished by the Navy Department with any such definition as that contained here. No doubt they consulted some naval people. As I told the Senator before, I can bring over tomorrow some of the maps or charts which attempt to define a naval policy, approved by the Secretary of the Navy; but I repeat what I said before: They are more in the nature of rules and regulations than a policy. So far as I know, the Navy Department has never written, for purposes of incorporation in a law, any policy.

Mr. NYE. Does the Senator feel that if we were to fulfill the authorization under this bill we should be able to bring about full protection of our interests on the high seas?

Mr. WALSH. Personally, I do not think so. I think we should approach it. In the face of this record, in the face of the fact that after 10 years, if we should build all the ships authorized in this bill, and Japan and Great Britain should stop and never build another vessel, we should have a deficiency in the 5-5-3 ratio, I cannot say that even then we should be powerful enough to overcome possible enemies; but we certainly should be approaching it, and perhaps in the event of being able to delay a war, if war should come, we might be able hastily to build sufficient other naval craft to give us equality.

The committee's opinion as stated in the report on the bill is as follows:

The committee is of the opinion that the Navy authorized in this section of the bill will be sufficient to provide an adequate defense to America provided the foreign nations do not expand their navies beyond what we now believe they are doing. It is not, in the committee's opinion, sufficiently strong to make certain our success in case of foreign attack, but it is believed to be sufficient to provide reasonable assurance that we will not be attacked.

Mr. NYE. Admiral Leahy testified, if I am not mistaken, that we were maintaining something like 42 ships in Asiatic waters, including 6 submarines.

Mr. WALSH. I think that is correct.

Mr. NYE. Is the Senator prepared to say what the cost of maintenance of this fleet is?

Mr. WALSH. The officers and the vessels would have to be somewhere, and the officers and men would have to be furnished food. I suppose the real additional cost would be for fuel for the trip there and back. Of course, if the vessels were in San Pedro Harbor, they would have to be fueled. I doubt whether the cost would be very much greater. I am answering the Senator hastily and quickly. The men would be on the vessels even if they were on our own coast, the vessels would be here, they would be using fuel here, and the men would be eating food here. So I am inclined to think that the cost would not be very much greater. Of course, the cost of going back and forth, through that long mileage, would be an item which would be substantial because of the fuel used. If we think in terms of the men not being on the naval pay roll and the vessels not being naval vessels, then, of course, the cost would be very great.

Mr. NYE. Just one more question. I hesitate to keep the Senator on his feet longer.

Mr. WALSH. I am thankful if this is the last question.

Mr. NYE. Are we not confronted with this situation, that it is utterly impossible for us to hope to maintain that adequacy of naval preparation which would permit us to defend our interests whatever they might be, wherever they might arise?

Mr. WALSH. I personally think it is not impossible for us if we want to spend the money. I do think that the American people, and I think the present administration wisely feel that we ought to approach as near as possible that degree of naval strength which would give us a fighting

chance in the event of war, and that by certain maneuvers after war began we should be in a position to expand quickly and develop the balance of our Navy. I am frank to say that I think—and this was not my approach to the subject—the authorization is a mild one in view of the statistics we have, and I think it is helpful to the whole world to have an announcement made of what our policy is to be. I think it will lead within a reasonable time to the reaching of some understanding as to a limitation of naval armaments in the future.

I do not see how we can escape the responsibility of building up a Navy that will be adequate and will have some chance in conflict to protect us against an enemy. I cannot conceive of anything worse than having an impotent navy, ships going up and down the coast afraid of an enemy, a navy which will not come out and meet the enemy before they begin to bombard our cities, a navy that is conscious of its weaknesses, which realizes that the other navy has six more powerful battleships, has double the number of submarines and cruisers, has triple the number of airplanes. What would be a wise and sensible policy for the head of the Navy except to hug the shore, as poor Germany had to do during the World War, afraid to go out, knowing that the ships would be lost, as they were finally destroyed?

Mr. NYE. The Senator will agree that these possible enemies must come from across the Atlantic or across the Pacific?

Mr. WALSH. Yes. I would say so. I do not at the present time anticipate any enemies from South America. I think it is quite possible for some European country or some country in the Orient to seek, within a reasonably short time, within a few years, naval bases and possessions in South America.

Mr. NYE. The Senator really fears that?

Mr. WALSH. I do not say I fear it; I say it is a possibility which ought to be considered in connection with any program of defense. Of course, the Senator has heard a great many rumors, and has heard it suggested again and again that we ought to acquire land south of the southern California peninsula for purposes of defense, and the Senator has heard the inferences which have been drawn from that situation.

Mr. NYE. I have.

Mr. WALSH. I do not pay any special attention to it. I have no information along that line. But I do know that there is a belief, and a strong conviction, on the part of our defense officers, that we have to be very careful with respect to South America, and the prevention of any potential enemy from any other country getting in there.

Mr. NYE. From establishing a base there.

Mr. WALSH. One of the most effective ways of making a great deal of trouble for us in the event of war would be to get an effective air base in South America. If any country in South America were hostile to us and wanted to give encouragement to any potential enemy, they could be very embarrassing and troublesome to us by permitting bases to be set up.

Mr. NYE. Of course, I am ready to concede, and I want it understood that if any effort were made to establish such a base in South America I would be one of those who would want to destroy any chance of that development.

Mr. WALSH. It is gratifying to find that we are all in accord in desiring a Navy, and we have little criticism to make of it. What we are concerned and troubled about is that the situation is so pressing that we ought to expand. There is a friendly difference of opinion, and an honest difference of opinion, and I want the Senator to know that, so far as I am concerned, I respect the views he and those who think with him entertain.

Mr. NYE. My own conclusion is that we are adequately prepared to repulse any such effort, even in South America, on the part of a foe from across the Atlantic or across the Pacific. I am at a loss to understand why any of us would fear the ability on the part of any European power today to chance departure from its own front yard or back yard

long enough, with such force as it would need to have weight, to establish bases in South America. Does the Senator feel that that is within the possibilities in a generation?

Mr. WALSH. I personally feel that the fears of our experts are in another direction than the one to which the Senator has referred. Is that plain enough?

Mr. NYE. I think the Senator makes himself understood.

Mr. WALSH. I am trying to avoid a record which might tend to increase any differences which may exist, if they do exist, rather than diminish them.

Mr. President, in yielding the floor, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the tables and other data to which I have referred during the course of my remarks.

There being no objection, the matters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT FROM THE REPORT OF THE SENATE COMMITTEE ON NAVAL AFFAIRS ON THE 5-5-3 RATIO

The 5-5-3 ratio fixed by the Washington Treaty of 1922 was one part only of a system of interdependent provisions agreed upon at that time, including the nonfortification provision (which required material sacrifices by the United States), the Four Power and Nine Power Pacts. The object of the ratio was, to assure each of the parties to the treaty security against one or a combination of the other parties. It was worked out upon a strictly scientific basis and, after some discussion, was accepted by the parties concerned as a fair basis of security.

Since this ratio was agreed upon as one part of a series of interdependent provisions, the situation in the Pacific has altered radically. Japan has occupied by force large sections of China. It has ignored the Four Power Pact. It has declined to participate in a conference called under the Nine Power Treaty. It has denounced the Washington Naval Treaty and declined, subsequently, to give assurances that it would observe in fact the provisions of that treaty or in fact be bound by any restrictions upon naval construction. It is believed to be in the interest of the security of the United States to adhere to the principle of the 5-5-3 ratio unless the political situation in the Pacific shall have been so altered as to permit agreement upon some other basis.

Whether or not the 5-5-3 ratio can be changed without disadvantage to the United States at a later date can be determined only by further study.

The committee is of the opinion that if in each class of ships we maintain not less than a 5-5 ratio with Great Britain, and a 5-3 ratio with Japan, we will make war unlikely for us, will insure the well-being and prosperity of our people, and will shorten any war we may be forced into.

The following is a section by section explanation of the bill:

SECTION 1

Public, No. 135, Seventy-third Congress, approved March 27, 1934—the so-called Vinson-Trammel Act—established the composition of the United States Navy with respect to the categories of vessels limited by the treaties signed in Washington, February 6, 1922, and at London, April 22, 1930, at the limit prescribed by those treaties. It authorized the President to construct a sufficient number of vessels to bring the United States Navy up to treaty strength and to maintain it thereat by replacing over-age vessels with vessels of modern design and construction.

Article 21 of the London Treaty of 1930, the so-called escalator clause, provides that any high contracting party which considers her national security to be materially affected by the new construction of a nonsignatory power may, with due notification to other signatories, increase tonnages within one or more categories. Other signatories may then make proportionate increases in the categories specified.

Great Britain invoked article 21 of this treaty on July 15, 1936, and on December 23, 1936. Japan invoked this article on December 29, 1936. The total tonnage allowed the United States was increased by 75,868 tons.

The present Navy building program, if continued until 1941 or 1942, will bring the United States Navy up to the original strength authorized for under-age vessels, except in the battleship class. The London Treaty of 1936 changed the effective life of battleships from 20 to 26 years. This change in the effective life of battleships and the increases in allowances due to the so-called escalator clause have changed the situation very materially. Under these conditions we have now built, building, and appropriated for our full allotted under-age strength in battleships, cruisers, and aircraft carriers, and we are short approximately 63,935 tons in destroyers and 8,813 tons in submarines.

Section 1 of the bill increases the authorized number and tonnage allowances of combatant vessels in the Navy by approximately 23 percent. The following table shows the original allowances as authorized by the treaties and the act of March 27, 1934, the increased allowances due to the so-called escalator clause, the total allowances now authorized; the increased allowances proposed by the bill, as amended, and the total allowed under-age strength of the Navy if the bill is enacted:

Type of vessels	(Column 1)		(Column 2)	(Column 3)		(Column 4)		(Column 5)	
	Original treaty allowance		Increases due to art. 21, London Treaty	Total authorized under Vinson-Trammell Act, under-age vessels		Authorized increase by H. R. 9218, under-age vessels as amended by the Committee		Total authorized by H. R. 9218, under-age vessels as amended by the Committee	
	Number	Tonnage	Tonnage	Number	Tonnage	Number	Tonnage	Number	Tonnage
Capital ships	15	525,000		15	525,000	3	135,000	18	660,000
Aircraft carriers		135,000		16	135,000	2	40,000	8	175,000
Cruisers A	18	180,000		18	180,000			18	180,000
Cruisers B		143,500	20,270	19	163,770	9	68,754	28	232,524
Destroyers		150,000	40,000	121	190,000	23	38,000	144	228,000
Submarines		52,700	15,598	47	68,298	9	13,658	56	81,956
Total		1,186,200	75,868	226	1,262,068	46	295,412	272	1,557,480

¹ Present law (Vinson-Trammell Act) limits total tonnages only in these categories.

² H. R. 9218 combines cruiser tonnages authorizing a total of 412,524 tons.

³ Great Britain invoked art. 21 of the London Treaty of 1930 on Dec. 23, 1936.

⁴ Great Britain invoked art. 21 of the London Treaty of 1930 on July 15, 1936.

⁵ Japan invoked art. 21 of the London Treaty of 1930 on Dec. 29, 1936.

The bill as passed by the House of Representatives authorized an increase of 105,000 tons in battleship tonnage and 30,000 tons in aircraft-carrier tonnage. Three battleships of 35,000 tons each and two aircraft carriers of 15,000 tons each could be built under this authorization. The committee amendment increases the battleship tonnage by 30,000 tons and the aircraft-carrier tonnage by 10,000 tons. This will permit the construction of three battleships of 45,000 tons each and two aircraft carriers of 20,000 tons each.

The United States and Great Britain in the London Treaty of 1936 agreed to limit the size of battleships to 35,000 tons standard displacement. Japan is not a signatory to this treaty. This agreement on the size of capital ships was in effect when the bill passed the House of Representatives. Since that date this agreement has been abrogated. It now appears that other nations will build battleships in excess of 35,000 tons displacement. If other nations build large ships it will be necessary for our Navy to possess ships in excess of 35,000 tons if it is to perform its vital function of meeting and defeating an enemy at sea.

The Navy now has two 15,000-ton aircraft carriers and two 20,000-ton aircraft carriers. In addition to the U. S. S. *Lexington* and U. S. S. *Saratoga*, which are 33,000-ton ships. It is now definitely established by extensive experience in the fleet that tonnage is critical as regards the war usefulness of aircraft carriers. If two new carriers of 20,000 tons each are built they will be as effective as the *Yorktown* and *Enterprise*. These ships have with respect to the 15,000-ton carriers greater speed, armor, and torpedo protection, better stability for rough-weather operation, longer cruising radius, and more room and better facilities for efficient and rapid operation of their aircraft. These advantages, particularly in speed and protection, are vital and out of all proportion to the moderate increase in cost.

This increase in aircraft carrier tonnage will greatly increase the national-defense value of these carriers.

The committee is of the opinion that the Navy authorized in this section of the bill will be sufficient to provide an adequate defense to America provided the foreign nations do not expand their navies beyond what we now believe they are doing. It is not, in the committee's opinion, sufficiently strong to make certain our success in case of foreign attack, but it is believed to be sufficient to provide reasonable assurance that we will not be attacked.

SECTION II

The act of March 17, 1934, not only authorized the President to construct a sufficient number of vessels to bring the Navy up to treaty strength but it also authorized him to maintain it thereat by replacing over-age vessels with vessels of modern design and construction. Section 2 of this bill authorizes the President to construct a sufficient number of vessels to bring the Navy up to the new authorized strength and to maintain it thereat by replacing vessels as they become over-age.

The Navy can be maintained permanently at the under-age strength shown in column 5 of the table without additional legislative authority and subject only to appropriations made by the Congress.

SECTION III

An act approved June 24, 1926 (Public, No. 422, 69th Cong.), established the number of useful airplanes (including spare parts and equipment) to be employed in the Navy at 1,000, and authorized the Secretary of the Navy to acquire and maintain not less than this number of useful airplanes. This act also stated:

"That 'useful airplanes,' as used in this act, shall be those airplanes on the Navy list which are, or which after reasonable repairs can be made, in all respects safe to fly and fitted to take part in active military operations in time of war, and shall be exclusive of those airplanes classified as experimental or, with the approval of the Secretary of the Navy, declared obsolete."

An act approved March 27, 1934 (the Vinson-Trammell Act), authorized the President to procure the necessary naval aircraft for vessels and other naval purposes in numbers commensurate with a treaty navy. The Secretary of the Navy has determined that 2,050 naval aircraft are required for such a navy.

Section 3 of the present bill authorizes the President to acquire or construct additional naval airplanes, including patrol planes, spare parts, and equipment, so as to bring the number of useful naval airplanes to a total of not less than 3,000. This is an increase of 950 useful airplanes.

The increased number of planes is based upon the requirements for a naval aeronautical organization proportionate to the increased Navy contemplated by the bill.

Not less than 3,000 useful naval airplanes can be maintained permanently without additional legislative authority and subject only to appropriations made by the Congress.

The committee is impressed with the marked increase that has been taking place in the range, speed, and bomb capacity of new naval aircraft, and the increasing capabilities of naval aviation in operations with the fleet. The authorization in this section recognizes the value of our naval aviation and will make it possible for this weapon to support effectively the efficiency and power of the fleet.

SECTION 4

Section 4 of the bill as passed by the House of Representatives authorized the construction of 22 auxiliary vessels. The committee amendment authorizes the construction of 26 auxiliary vessels—3 destroyer tenders, 2 submarine tenders, 3 large seaplane tenders, 7 small seaplane tenders, 1 repair ship, 4 oil tankers, 1 mine layer, 3 mine sweepers, and 2 fleet tugs, of a total light displacement tonnage of 133,650 tons.

This is the number and type of auxiliary vessels that the Navy Department believes are most urgently needed at the present time. The estimated cost of these 26 auxiliary vessels is \$216,450,000, an amount \$30,000,000 less than the estimated cost of the 22 auxiliary vessels proposed by the House committee.

Auxiliaries may be divided into two broad classes—tenders and other auxiliaries.

The tenders are those vessels which serve destroyers, submarines, and patrol planes, and which are essential to their operation and maintenance at all times, both in time of peace and in time of war. They, therefore, should be provided in a definite proportion to the vessels or planes they tend.

The other types of auxiliaries, oilers, store ships, cargo ships, mine sweepers, etc., will be required in large numbers in time of war, in numbers too great to be built or operated by the Navy in time of peace.

The bill authorizes the construction of only those types of auxiliary vessels that will be required for the operation and maintenance of the fleet in time of peace. The bill does not authorize the replacement of auxiliary vessels as they become obsolete.

The fleet in fulfilling its naval mission of protection to the homeland in time of war must take up its station far from normal bases of supply and repair. To be effective the combatant vessels of the Navy must be so mobile and so self-sufficient that they can be projected a thousand miles or more from our coast and be maintained on their far-distant stations. The combatant fleet requires naval auxiliaries that must operate and train with the fleet during peacetime as well as in war. The mission of the auxiliaries is to make effective, through the function of service and supply, the fighting vessels of the fleet.

The committee was informed that additional auxiliary vessels will be required for the operation of the fleet in peacetime and that it will be necessary for the Navy to request the Congress in the near future for authority to acquire or construct additional auxiliary vessels. The present bill is therefore not a complete program covering all the needs of the Navy for auxiliary vessels. The committee is of the opinion that additional authorizing acts for auxiliary vessels should be made from year to year.

Additional data on auxiliary vessels

DESTROYER TENDER

Destroyers are comparatively small vessels, with a large amount of their interior space devoted to boilers and engines. They carry a large armament of guns and torpedoes, which require a comparatively large crew. Consequently there is not room on such small vessels for all the facilities they must have to maintain them

for long periods. Their storerooms are limited, they have no facilities for making extensive repairs, they lack many facilities for personnel such as dental offices, and space for men incapacitated by illness. The tender supplies these shortcomings for the destroyers she serves. It accompanies the fleet to which the destroyers are attached or remains at the base to repair or overhaul them, overhaul their torpedoes, or to supply torpedoes to take the place of torpedoes expended, to refuel them, to fill up their ice boxes and provision storerooms, give them fresh bread, take care of any seriously sick men. Tenders were at one time called "mother ships."

Each of these destroyer tenders will have a displacement of approximately 9,000 tons and a speed of 16½ knots.

SUBMARINE TENDERS

Submarine tenders, like destroyer tenders, are "mother ships" for the submarines based on them. The submarines are even more dependent on tenders than destroyers because the submarine, designed to operate both on the surface and beneath the surface, has the interior so cramped with machinery that space is very limited for the accommodation of personnel or the stowage of spare parts, provisions, ammunition, and similar essential items. The complement of a submarine is based on the number of men required for battle and watch-standing duties. Since the number must be kept at a minimum because of lack of space, the complement cannot include the artificer specialists required for material upkeep. The submarine is dependent, therefore, on the tender for not only the general overhaul of machinery, torpedoes, optics, and general construction work but for assistance in routine upkeep as well. All the shortcomings of the submarine have to be provided for in the tender. She carries their doctor, their paymaster, and other personnel for whom there is no room on the submarines. The submarine tender is specifically a supply, repair, provision, and ammunition ship for a squadron of submarines.

Each of these submarine tenders will have a displacement of approximately 9,000 tons and a speed of 16½ knots.

SEAPLANE TENDERS

The seaplane tender is designed to serve as a floating base for large patrol seaplanes, sometimes called flying boats. The tender permits the patrol planes to operate anywhere away from a regular shore air station. It permits the patrol planes, which are a part of the fleet, to accompany the fleet wherever it may go. Patrol planes are not carried by the tender but fly from one position to another. The tender, however, can hoist planes on its deck for repairs, and it can pick up damaged planes. The tender provides barracks for the crews of the planes, and provides all the facilities for the personnel that any large ship has. It also carries gasoline, bombs, stores, spare parts for the planes, and can make all necessary repairs short of a complete rebuilding, which can only be done at a shore base.

The bill provides for three large seaplane tenders and seven small seaplane tenders.

REPAIR SHIP

All large vessels of the fleet have some facilities for making their own repairs, for routine upkeep, and to meet emergencies. They have a machine shop, a carpenter shop, an electrical shop, blacksmith shop, etc. These with their artificers are utilized to the fullest extent. Repair ships fill in the gap to make repairs that are beyond the capacity of the individual ships and still not of such a character as to require a ship to go to a navy yard. The repair ships have foundries and machine shops that are capable of doing much heavier work than can be done on the combatant ships. They can make major electrical repairs, repair navigation instruments, fire-control gear, optical instruments and other delicate work requiring highly specialized mechanics. Repair ships can supply light and power to the ship under repair if necessary. Generally speaking, the repair ships make the repairs in battleships, carriers, heavy and light cruisers, and auxiliary vessels, while the tenders repair the destroyers, submarines, and aircraft.

In time of war, the repair ships accompany the fleet and in addition to normal repairs, repair damage inflicted by the enemy or patch the ships so they can get back to a navy yard for extensive repairs.

The existing repair ships in the Navy are not well adapted for making large-hull repairs, such as would result from hits by guns or bombs.

The repair ship included in this bill will be about 9,500 tons, light displacement, and 16½ knots speed.

OIL TANKERS

The primary service of oilers is to transport all kinds of fuel and oil for the use of the fleet. Navy oilers carry not only fuel oil for the boilers of the ships of the fleet, but they also carry Diesel oil for submarines, lubricating oils for machinery, gasoline for airplanes, and gasoline for ships' boats. They differ in this respect from merchant oilers which usually carry only one kind of fuel. They should have speed in order that they can accompany the fleet and refuel it immediately after arrival at its destination. Navy oilers also must be fitted with the necessary gear for refueling small vessels at sea. This requires pumps that can discharge at a rapid rate. Merchant oilers do not have such gear for refueling vessels at sea, and as a rule do not have pumps of the required capacity because they usually depend upon pumping systems ashore to load and discharge them quickly. These requirements for Navy oilers are in addition to their guns, ammunition, and other strictly military features.

MINE LAYERS

Mine layers may be used to lay mines in defense of our own home ports or bases, or they may be used to lay mines in enemy waters. There are two mine layers in the Navy at the present time. Only one of these, the *Oglala*, is in commission. None were built as mine layers, but were converted from coast freight steamers. Both are now almost unseaworthy.

It is considered essential that at least one currently designed mine layer be provided for service in the fleet without delay in order that the art of mine laying may be kept alive in the Navy and that we may keep abreast of modern developments in the art.

This vessel would be of about 6,000 tons, light displacement, and about 18 knots speed.

MINE SWEEPERS

Mine sweepers, as the name implies, are used to sweep areas and channels, through which the fleet or other vessels must pass, to clear them of mines. They will be used in war to accompany the fleet and they will also be employed off important bases or commercial ports where mines may be laid.

The question might be asked, "Why not have a vessel that would be a combined mine sweeper and tug?" Mine sweepers should be as small as possible in order to be handy, should have light draft to lessen the chances of their hulls striking a mine, and should have twin screws for good maneuverability. Tugs should be deep draft with large single screws, deeply immersed in order to get a good grip on the water for towing. Mine sweepers and tugs, therefore, are almost opposite extremes in underwater design. They cannot be combined without obtaining an indifferent vessel for either purpose.

The new vessels will have a displacement of approximately 700 tons and a speed of 18 knots.

TUGS

Tugs are a well-known type of vessel. Fleet tugs are used to tow targets for target practice, to assist in berthing vessels at docks, or to assist large vessels to maneuver in restricted space. In time of war they would be used to tow damaged vessels to port, to assist in their salvage, to place them alongside repair ships, to take disabled vessels in tow, and to tow or shift barges or lighters at advanced fleet bases.

In time of peace they are used for every kind of service in the naval districts and at outlying naval stations, as well as with the fleet.

SECTION 5

Section 5 of the bill authorizes to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to effectuate the purposes of this act, including appropriations for such essential equipment and facilities at navy yards as may be necessary in the construction of such ships as have been authorized or as are provided for in this bill.

To carry out the construction provisions of this bill, in conjunction with the construction program authorized by the act of March 27, 1934, some new equipment and facilities and the replacement of some existing equipment and facilities, such as cranes, tools, building ways, and other items, will be necessary.

The House report stated that the essential equipment and facilities required could be obtained at a cost of about \$8,000,000.

Under date of March 8, 1938, the Secretary of the Navy informed the chairman of the Committee on Naval Affairs, House of Representatives, that the amount of money required to provide equipment and facilities at navy yards for building ships is not \$8,000,000, but a much larger sum depending upon the exact work assigned in any particular navy yard and the extent of the additional facilities that must be provided to permit undertaking the assigned construction.

This letter stated that if battleships are to be constructed in the navy yards at Norfolk, Philadelphia, and New York, and if the navy yards at Portsmouth, N. H., Boston, Mass., Charleston, S. C., Puget Sound, Wash., and Mare Island, Calif., are to be provided with additional facilities the estimated cost would be in the neighborhood of \$30,000,000.

This estimate of \$30,000,000 for equipment and shipbuilding facilities at our present navy yards is to take care of the construction of approximately 50 percent of the ships authorized in this bill and the replacements authorized under the Vinson-Trammell Act.

It is believed that the authorization contained in this section of the bill is necessary in order that the shipbuilding programs may be carried out economically and efficiently.

SECTION 6

The committee amendment strikes out all of section 6 which authorizes an appropriation of \$15,000,000 to be expended for experimental work in connection with surface craft, lighter-than-air craft, heavier-than-air craft, aerial mines, and torpedoes, and which included an expenditure of \$3,000,000 for the construction of a rigid airship to be used for training and experimental purpose. It also strikes out the proviso that the Secretary of the Navy is authorized to enter into contracts with inventors and manufacturers for experimental work, models, plans, and other projects useful to the national defense to the extent of \$15,000,000.

In lieu thereof the committee amendment authorizes an appropriation of \$15,000,000 to be expended at the discretion of the President of the United States for the construction of experimental vessels none of which shall exceed 3,000 tons standard displacement.

The committee was informed that no additional statutory authority is a necessary precedent to appropriations by the Congress

for general purposes of experimentation. It is necessary, however, to provide an authorization for appropriations for the construction of experimental vessels.

The committee considers that the primary needs of the Navy Department for experimental purposes will be met by an authorization of \$15,000,000 to be expended for the construction of experimental vessels.

The committee is also of the opinion that early action should be taken by the Appropriations Committees to provide ample funds for aviation experimentation and development.

SECTION 7

This section of the bill directs that the allocation and construction of the vessels authorized and their replacements as well as the procurement and construction of airplanes and spare parts shall be in accordance with the act of March 27, 1934, as amended. This act provides (1) that normally 50 percent of the vessels will be constructed in Government yards; (2) that no less than 10 percent of the aircraft, including engines therefor, shall be constructed in Government aircraft factories; and (3) that the profit on contracts, except for scientific instruments, where the award exceeds \$10,000 is limited to a maximum of 10 percent.

SECTION 8

Section 8 of the bill defines the term "under-age" as that given in accordance with the London Treaty of 1936.

In accordance with the London Naval Treaty of 1936 vessels of the following categories and subcategories shall be deemed to be "over-age" when the undermentioned number of years have elapsed since completion:

	Years
(a) Capital ships.....	26
(b) Aircraft carriers.....	20
(c) Cruisers, subcategories (a, heavy; b, light):	
If laid down before Jan. 1, 1920.....	16
If laid down after Dec. 31, 1919.....	20
(d) Light surface vessels, subcategory (c).....	16
(e) Submarines.....	13

SECTION 9

Section 9 states that—

"The United States would welcome and support an international conference for naval limitations and in the event of an international treaty for the further limitations of naval armament to which the United States is signatory, the President is authorized and empowered to suspend so much of its naval construction as has been authorized as may be necessary to bring the naval armament of the United States within the limitations so agreed upon, except that such suspension shall not apply to vessels and aircraft then actually under construction."

SECTION 10

In view of the increases provided for the Navy in this bill, it appears that additional naval operating bases for some of the units of the fleet will be necessary.

Section 10 authorizes and directs the Secretary of the Navy to appoint a board of not less than five officers to investigate and report upon the need, for purposes of national defense, for the establishment of additional submarine, destroyer, mine, and naval air bases on the continental coasts of the United States, its Territories, and possessions.

It further directs the Secretary of the Navy to cause the report of this board to be transmitted to the Speaker of the House of Representatives during the first session of the Seventy-sixth Congress.

SECTION 11

Section 11 directs the Navy Department to construct upon the Pacific coast of the United States such vessels as the President of the United States may determine to be necessary in order to maintain shipyard facilities on the Pacific coast necessary and adequate to meet the requirements of national defense.

Although prior to and during the World War shipbuilding was a major industry on the Pacific coast, it has practically ceased to

exist, and, except for limited activity in the two navy yards in that area, shipbuilding and ship construction would have become a lost art.

In the event of a major naval engagement in the Pacific its casualties, unless very limited in number, would be repaired only after the long and hazardous voyage to the more highly organized shipyards on the Atlantic coast. The resulting delay might spell disaster. It might be impossible for a seriously crippled major vessel to pass through the Panama Canal, and the trip around Cape Horn would be out of the question.

The inclusion of this section in the bill may lead to the restoration of these facilities, old shipyards may be rejuvenated, and the necessary trained personnel may be reorganized, all of which are essential in our scheme of national defense.

SECTION 12

The new section which has been added to the bill provides that the vessels authorized in this bill shall be built in accordance with the provisions of Public, No. 846 (74th Cong.), commonly known as the Walsh-Healey Act. This law requires the Navy Department and every other Department of the Government in contracting for supplies and materials to adhere strictly to the provisions of the act, which fixes maximum hours and minimum wages. The Navy Department must comply with this law for all contracts let for the purchase of supplies and materials in excess of \$10,000. The Baker-Davis law fixes minimum wages and maximum hours in the letting of contracts by the Government in the construction of public buildings. The original act, i. e., the Walsh-Healey Act, does not apply to the construction of vessels. This provision would require the Navy Department to incorporate the terms of this law in its contracts with private shipbuilding concerns in the building of vessels in accordance with Public, No. 846.

The President's message on national defense, the Navy Department's report on the bill, statistical tables, and data furnished the committee by the Secretary of the Navy and the Department of State are hereby made a part of this report.

TABLE I.—Treaty allowances under the Washington Treaty of 1922 and the London Treaty of 1930

	United States	Great Britain	Japan	France	Italy
	Tons	Tons	Tons	Tons	Tons
Capital ships.....	13,525,000	13,525,000	13,315,000	11,755,000	11,755,000
Aircraft carriers.....	135,000	135,000	81,000	60,000	60,000
Cruisers A.....	180,000	146,800	108,400	(1)	(1)
Cruisers B.....	143,500	192,200	100,450	(1)	(1)
Destroyers.....	150,000	150,000	105,500	(1)	(1)
Submarines.....	52,700	52,700	52,700	(1)	(1)
Total.....	1,186,200	1,201,700	763,050	-----	-----

¹15 vessels.

²Replacement allowances.

³9 vessels.

⁴France and Italy are not limited as to number of vessels, but are limited in tonnage to 175,000 tons.

⁵France and Italy did not ratify the London Treaty fixing allowances in these categories.

⁶15,500 tons may be added to this amount if the United States elects to have only 15 8-inch gun cruisers instead of 18 8-inch gun cruisers.

⁷80,000 tons may not be completed until 1936, 1937, and 1938.

TABLE II

Table II shows the comparison between the original treaty allowances and naval composition authorized by H. R. 9218.

The following table shows the original allowances as authorized by the treaties and the act of March 27, 1934, the increased allowances due to the so-called escalator clause, the total allowances now authorized; the increased allowances proposed by the bill, as amended, and the total allowed under-age strength of the Navy if the bill is enacted:

TABLE II

Type of vessels	Column 1		Column 2		Column 3		Column 4		Column 5	
	Original treaty allowances		Increases due to article 21 of London Treaty		Total authorized under Vinson-Trammell Act (under-age vessels)		Authorizes increased by H. R. 9218 (under-age vessels)		Total composition authorized by H. R. 9218 (under-age vessels)	
	Number of vessels	Tonnage	Number of vessels	Tonnage	Number of vessels	Tonnage	Number of vessels	Tonnage	Number of vessels	Tonnage
Capital ships.....	15	525,000	15	525,000	3	135,000	18	660,000	18	660,000
Aircraft carriers.....	1	135,000	1	135,000	2	40,000	8	175,000	8	175,000
Cruisers A.....	18	180,000	18	180,000	9	68,754	27	248,754	27	248,754
Cruisers B.....	143,500	20,270	119	163,770	23	38,000	144	228,000	144	228,000
Destroyers.....	150,000	40,000	121	190,000	9	13,658	56	81,956	56	81,956
Submarines.....	52,700	15,598	47	68,298						
Total.....		1,186,200		75,868	226	1,262,068	46	295,412	272	1,557,480

¹ Present law (Vinson-Trammell Act) limits total tonnages only in these categories.

² H. R. 9218 combines cruiser tonnages authorizing a total of 412,524 tons.

³ Great Britain invoked art. 21 of the London Treaty of 1930 on Dec. 23, 1936.

⁴ Great Britain invoked art. 21 of the London Treaty of 1930 on July 15, 1936.

⁵ Japan invoked art. 21 of the London Treaty of 1930 on Dec. 29, 1936.

TABLE III.—Summary—United States

[Table III is a summary of United States vessels built, building, and appropriated for as of Mar. 15, 1938]
 [From information received up to Mar. 15, 1938]

Type	Built						Building and appropriated for ¹		Grand total	
	Under-age ¹ under 1936 London Treaty ²		Over-age ¹ under 1936 London Treaty		Total ¹					
	Number	Approximate tons	Number	Tons	Number	Approximate tons	Number	Approximate tons	Number	Approximate tons
Capital ships.....	15	464,300	-----	-----	15	464,300	2	70,000	17	534,300
Aircraft carriers.....	3	80,500	-----	-----	3	80,500	3	54,500	6	135,000
Cruisers A.....	17	161,200	(³)	(³)	¹⁷ 17	^{161,200} 161,200	1	10,000	18	171,200
Cruisers B.....	10	70,500	(³)	(³)	¹⁰ 10	^{70,500} 70,500	9	90,000	19	160,500
Destroyers.....	35	53,080	¹⁶⁸ 168	190,260	203	243,340	49	76,050	252	319,390
Submarines.....	22	32,580	62	43,340	84	75,920	16	23,185	100	99,105
Total.....	102	862,160	230	233,600	332	1,095,760	80	323,735	412	1,419,495

Capital ships and destroyers, under-age and over-age, under Washington and 1936 London Treaties

	Under-age		Over-age		Total	
	Number	Approximate tons	Number	Tons	Number	Approximate tons
Capital ships.....	7	227,500	8	236,800	15	464,300
Destroyers.....	32	49,510	171	193,830	203	243,340

Age limits of other types the same as in the 1936 treaty.

¹ Age as at the end of 1937.

² Under-age and total built do not include the following ships commissioned but not fully completed: 3 cruisers B, *Philadelphia*, *Savannah*, and *Brooklyn*, totaling 20,000 tons; 1 aircraft carrier, *Yorktown*, 19,900 tons; 14 destroyers (12 of 1,500 tons each, 2 of 1,850) totaling 21,700 tons; 1 submarine, *Snapper*, 1,445 tons. Included under "Building and appropriated for."

³ Summary does not include the following over-age cruisers, not disposed of, but equivalent to hulks: 2 cruisers A, *Seattle*, 13,700 tons; *Rochester*, 7,350 tons. 1 cruiser B, *Olympia*, 5,400 tons, awaiting congressional action to establish her as a naval relic.

⁴ Over-age destroyers include the following: 8 light minelayers, 9,400 tons; 2 mobile targets, 2,150 tons; total (10 vessels), 11,550 tons.

Table IV shows naval vessels built (under-age), building and appropriated for, as of March 15, 1938, by the United States, Great Britain, and Japan.

TABLE IV.—Vessels built (under-age), building and appropriated for, as of Mar. 15, 1938

Approximate ratio	United States		Great Britain		Japan	
	5.00		6.6		3.3	
	Number of vessels	Tonnage	Number of vessels	Tonnage	Number of vessels	Tonnage
Battleships.....	17	534,300	20	649,700	10	301,400
Aircraft carriers.....	6	135,000	11	229,350	6	88,470
Cruisers A.....	18	171,200	15	145,120	12	107,800
Cruisers B.....	19	160,500	42	302,670	16	100,445
Destroyers.....	84	129,130	129	189,849	85	116,433
Submarines.....	38	55,765	57	65,734	44	64,262
Total.....	182	1,185,895	274	1,582,423	173	778,810

NOTE.—The information regarding Japan does not include any ships under the 5-year replenishment program which commenced Apr. 1, 1937. This program is estimated to include approximately 66 vessels, as follows: 3 capital ships, 5 aircraft carriers, 7 cruisers, 43 destroyers, 8 submarines.

Table VI is a comparison of sizes of navies of Great Britain, Japan, and the United States in the event Japan and Great Britain build no additional naval vessels and the United States completes the naval vessels authorized in H. R. 9218.

On the assumption that reported Japanese and other foreign programs are correct, the relative ratios of approximate tons of the various types of warships, over-age and under-age, reported built, building, appropriated for, or projected, including tonnage authorized in this bill, will be:

TABLE VI

[Tons are in hundreds of thousands]

Type	Great Britain		United States		Japan		France		Italy		Germany		Union of Soviet Socialist Republics	
	Tons	Ratio	Tons	Ratio	Tons	Ratio	Tons	Ratio	Tons	Ratio	Tons	Ratio	Tons	Ratio
Capital ships.....	7.3	5	7.1	4.9	4.2	2.9	2.3	1.6	2.3	1.6	2.1	1.4	1.7	1.2
Aircraft carriers.....	2.5	5	1.6	3.2	1.4	2.8	.6	1.2	0	0	.4	.8	1.2	.4
Cruisers A.....	4.4	1	1.7	5	.5	4.4	.7	2.1	.8	2.4	.3	.9	1.5	.4
Cruisers B.....	4.5	5	2.4	2.7	2.2	2.4	1.0	1.1	.8	.9	.7	.8	3.4	.3
Destroyers.....	2.7	3.6	3.7	5	2.2	2.9	1.5	2	1.6	2.2	.5	.68	7	.95
Submarines.....	.8	3.3	1.2	5	.9	3.8	.9	3.8	1.1	4.6	.3	1.3	.9	3.8
Total.....	19.2	5	17.7	4.6	12.4	3.2	7.0	1.8	6.6	1.7	4.3	1.1	4.3	1.1

Table VII shows the existing ratios in the number of under-age vessels in the navies of the United States, Great Britain, and Japan.

Existing ratios in the number of under-age vessels in the navies of Japan, United States, and Great Britain, including those in commission, building, appropriated for, and projected at the present time, from the best information available from foreign sources are as follows:

TABLE VII

	British	United States	Japan
Capital ships.....	5	3.8	2.8
Aircraft carriers.....	5	2.7	4.5
Heavy cruisers.....	5	6	4
Light cruisers.....	5	2.3	2.3
Destroyers.....	5	3	4.1
Submarines.....	5	3.2	3.9

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, the questions just asked by the Senator from North Dakota and the observations of the Senator from Massachusetts prompt me to say a brief word.

I am not as yet certain whether I shall vote for the pending bill or vote against it. I would not knowingly vote for the expenditure of a single dollar which would lead to aggression, or which would contribute to war with other nations of the earth. I do want a Navy adequate to the needs of the country, and I suppose every other Senator has the same desire. The difficulty which confronts us is the application of this principle to the troubled facts which exist in the world today.

I am particularly interested in what was said about the countries to the south of us. I have been abroad for something more than 3 months and have but recently returned. In my contacts in Egypt, where I have been with citizens of other nations, it was impressed upon me that war is expected by every nation in Europe. There was not a delegate from any country in Europe with whom I talked who did not expect war in Europe, and no man with whom I conferred had the temerity to express an opinion as to the limits within which war could be confined.

I think we all recognize that there are throughout the world what we call "have not" nations. There are three conspicuous examples of nations which are without foreign territorial possessions. Each of those nations is an expanding and an aggressive nation. Each one of them has gone beyond its limits, and by force has sought to assert authority over what has been heretofore land foreign to them.

One of the nations is overrunning a part of the East. Another of those nations has crossed the Mediterranean and gone into Africa. Still another has very recently extended its boundaries at the expense of a nation of Europe with which it was nominally at peace. What the end of these ambitions and aggressions will be I do not know.

Mr. President, I have observed one disturbing thing. It does not harmonize with what we call our good-neighbor policy. I cannot square it with what I should like to believe. I think it was demonstrated at the recent conference which I attended that there are nations of Europe which have a greater influence to the south of us than has the United States. I think there are three nations in Europe that today have in South America, and particularly in the countries of the eastern seaboard of South America, a greater influence than has the United States of America.

Mr. President, I do not consider it beyond the range of possibility that we in this country will sometime in the future have to abandon the traditional policy of this United States for more than 100 years of time, or we may have to go to war to insure the territorial and political integrity of some of the nations of South America.

I am not troubled about aggression by the United States. I am not disturbed as to the possibility of the United States meddling in Europe, but I am gravely concerned as to whether some of the nations in the Far East and whether nations in Europe may not bring their meddling here to this continent and to the waters adjacent to this continent. That, to me, is a very real and a very serious problem to be taken into account in the consideration of the naval bill.

Mr. President, I interrupted the Senator from Massachusetts only because I wanted to give expression to this doubt which is in my mind and which has some bearing on my attitude toward the naval bill.

NATIONAL DEFENSE—GENERAL STAFF

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 3590) to amend an act entitled "An act for making further and more effectual provision for the national defense, and for other purposes," approved June 3, 1916, as amended by the act of June 4, 1920, so as to make available certain other officers for General Staff duty, which were, on page 2, line 4, to strike out "Guard or" and insert "Guard,"; in line 4, after "Reserves", to insert a comma and "or Reserve Officers' Corps"; in line 15, to strike out "Guard or" and insert "Guard,"; and in the same line, after "Reserves", to insert a comma and "or Reserve Officers' Training Corps."

Mr. SHEPPARD. I move that the Senate concur in the amendments of the House.

The motion was agreed to.

TRANSPORTATION OF PASSENGERS ON CANADIAN VESSELS

Mr. COPELAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House Joint Resolution 463, to permit the transportation of passengers by Canadian passenger vessels between the port of Rochester, N. Y., and the port of Alexandria Bay, N. Y., on Lake Ontario and the St. Lawrence River. The joint resolution is Order of Business No. 1631 on the calendar.

This measure is similar to the bill we passed last year to cover that one season, and is to cover the present season. There are no American ships operating in that service.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, this joint resolution is similar to the bill the consideration of which I objected to in the last session. Has the matter had further consideration by the committee at the present session?

Mr. COPELAND. It has; yes.

Mr. WHITE. I am not going to object, but I dislike exceedingly to see even an exception made and a breach in the protection to American ships which we have heretofore accorded them. I shall not object, but I express my regret that the chairman of the Commerce Committee has given his approval to the proposed legislation.

Mr. COPELAND. Mr. President, I regret that there are no American ships operating in that service.

Mr. WHITE. Of course, if we are going to permit foreign ships to engage in the service we will never have American ships operating in it.

Mr. COPELAND. The joint resolution provides for one season, and it was the conclusion of the committee that the permit should be granted.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution?

Mr. COPELAND. I understood the Senator from Maine to state that he would not object.

Mr. WHITE. I expressed my feeling but did not object.

Mr. McNARY. I have no objection. Will not the Senator from New York make a brief statement concerning the measure?

Mr. COPELAND. The joint resolution is designed to permit a shipping line running from Rochester, N. Y., to the port of Alexandria Bay, N. Y., on Lake Ontario and the St. Lawrence River, to be operated in what is really coastal trade. We have no American ships in this service. This is the only service out of the city of Rochester. It is desired that it may be continued this year as it was last.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate having heard the statement of the Senator from New York, is there objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution?

There being no objection, the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 463) to permit the transportation of passengers by Canadian passenger vessels between the port of Rochester, N. Y., and the port of Alexandria Bay, N. Y., on Lake Ontario and the St. Lawrence River, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That until such time as passenger service shall be established by vessels of the United States between the port of Rochester, N. Y., and the port of Alexandria Bay, N. Y., the Secretary of Commerce is authorized in his discretion to issue annually permits to Canadian passenger vessels to transport passengers between these ports; such Canadian vessels holding such permits not to be subject to the provisions of section 8 of the act of June 19, 1886, as amended by section 2 of the act of February 17, 1898 (46 U. S. C., sec. 289).

NAVAL-EXPANSION PROGRAM

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 9218) to establish the composition of the United States Navy, to authorize the construction of certain naval vessels, and for other purposes.

Mr. McNARY. In the absence of the Senator from Massachusetts, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Adams	Dieterich	Lee	Radcliffe
Andrews	Donahay	Lewis	Reames
Ashurst	Duffy	Lodge	Reynolds
Austin	Ellender	Logan	Russell
Bailey	Frazier	Loneragan	Schwartz
Bankhead	George	Lundeen	Schwellenbach
Barkley	Gerry	McAdoo	Sheppard
Berry	Gillette	McCarran	Shipstead
Bilbo	Glass	McGill	Smathers
Bone	Green	McKellar	Smith
Borah	Hale	McNary	Thomas, Utah
Bridges	Harrison	Maloney	Townsend
Brown, Mich.	Hatch	Miller	Truman
Brown, N. H.	Hayden	Milton	Tydings
Bulkeley	Herring	Minton	Vandenberg
Bulow	Hill	Murray	Van Nuys
Byrd	Hitchcock	Neely	Wagner
Byrnes	Holt	Norris	Walsh
Capper	Hughes	Nye	Wheeler
Caraway	Johnson, Calif.	O'Mahoney	White
Chavez	Johnson, Colo.	Overton	
Connally	King	Pittman	
Copeland	La Follette	Pope	

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. THOMAS of Utah in the chair). Eighty-nine Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

Mr. WALSH. May we now proceed to dispose of the committee amendments?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The first committee amendment will be stated.

The first amendment of the Committee on Naval Affairs was, in section 1, page 2, after line 2, to strike out:

- (a) Capital ships, 105,000 tons, making a total authorized under-age tonnage of 630,000 tons.
- (b) Aircraft carriers, 30,000 tons, making a total authorized under-age tonnage of 165,000 tons.

And insert:

- (a) Capital ships, 135,000 tons, making a total authorized under-age tonnage of 660,000 tons.
- (b) Aircraft carriers, 40,000 tons, making a total authorized under-age tonnage of 175,000 tons.

So as to make the section read:

That in addition to the tonnages of the United States Navy as agreed upon and established by the treaties signed at Washington, February 6, 1922, and at London, April 22, 1930, and as authorized by the act of March 27, 1934 (48 Stat. 503), as amended by the act of June 25, 1936 (49 Stat. 1926), the authorized composition of the United States Navy in under-age vessels is hereby increased by the following tonnages:

- (a) Capital ships, 135,000 tons, making a total authorized under-age tonnage of 660,000 tons.
- (b) Aircraft carriers, 40,000 tons, making a total authorized under-age tonnage of 175,000 tons.
- (c) Cruisers, 68,754 tons, making a total authorized under-age tonnage of 412,524 tons.
- (d) Destroyers, 38,000 tons, making a total authorized under-age tonnage of 228,000 tons.
- (e) Submarines, 13,658 tons, making a total authorized under-age tonnage of 81,956 tons.

Mr. NYE. Mr. President, I should be inclined to oppose the first committee amendment.

Mr. WALSH. I ask that the first committee amendment be passed over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the first committee amendment will be passed over. The clerk will state the next amendment.

The next amendment was, on page 3, after line 10, to strike out:

SEC. 4. The President of the United States is hereby further authorized to acquire or to undertake the construction of the following auxiliary vessels:

- (a) Five destroyer tenders, a total of 45,000 tons light displacement tonnage;
- (b) Three submarine tenders, a total of 27,000 tons light displacement tonnage;
- (c) Four large seaplane tenders, a total of 33,200 tons light displacement tonnage;
- (d) Seven small seaplane tenders, a total of 11,550 tons light displacement tonnage; and
- (e) Three repair ships, a total of 28,500 tons light displacement tonnage.

And in lieu thereof to insert:

SEC. 4. The President of the United States is hereby further authorized to acquire and convert or to undertake the construction of the following auxiliary vessels:

- (a) Three destroyer tenders, a total of 27,000 tons light displacement tonnage;
- (b) Two submarine tenders, a total of 18,000 tons light displacement tonnage;
- (c) Three large seaplane tenders, a total of 25,000 tons light displacement tonnage;
- (d) Seven small seaplane tenders, a total of 11,550 tons light displacement tonnage;
- (e) One repair ship of 9,500 tons light displacement tonnage;
- (f) Four oil tankers, a total of 32,000 tons light displacement tonnage;
- (g) One mine layer of 6,000 tons light displacement tonnage;
- (h) Three mine sweepers, a total of 2,100 tons light displacement tonnage; and
- (i) Two fleet tugs, a total of 2,500 tons light displacement tonnage.

Mr. WALSH. I shall be glad to explain the amendment briefly. The House bill authorized the construction of 22 auxiliary vessels. The Senate bill authorizes the construction of 26 auxiliary vessels. The Senate amendment strikes out section 4 of the House bill and inserts a new section authorizing the construction of 26 auxiliary vessels.

It so happens that although the number of vessels is increased, the authorization costs are decreased. We asked the Navy Department to reduce to a minimum the absolute needs in the way of auxiliary vessels and to suggest those vessels which would be needed at once. The number of auxiliary vessels which the Navy Department appears to

need is increased; but by reason of the fact that most of the increases were of less expensive types, and the fact that the more expensive types were limited, the saving in the authorization is \$30,000,000.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment on page 3.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next committee amendment was on page 5, after line 3, to strike out:

SEC. 6. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of \$15,000,000 to be expended at the direction of the President of the United States for purposes of experimenting with surface craft, lighter-than-air craft, heavier-than-air craft, aerial bombs, aerial mines, torpedoes, and other inventions and material developments for the national defense, of which sum \$5,000,000 shall be expended for the construction of experimental vessels, none of which shall exceed 3,000 tons standard displacement, and \$3,000,000 of which shall be expended for the construction of a rigid airship of American design and American construction of a capacity not to exceed 3,000,000 cubic feet either fabric covered or metal covered to be used for training, experimental, and development purposes: *Provided*, That the Secretary of the Navy is hereby authorized to enter into contracts with inventors and manufacturers for experimental work, models, plans, materials, and the development of projects useful to the national defense to the extent of \$15,000,000 in addition to the sum authorized by this section to be appropriated.

And to insert in lieu thereof the following:

SEC. 6. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of \$15,000,000 to be expended at the discretion of the President of the United States for the construction of experimental vessels, none of which shall exceed 3,000 tons standard displacement.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next committee amendment was, on page 7, after line 17, to insert a new section, as follows:

SEC. 12. The construction, alteration, furnishing, or equipping of any Government vessel authorized by this act, or the construction, alteration, furnishing, or equipping of any Government vessel with funds from any appropriation available for such purposes after July 1, 1938, whether by contract or otherwise, shall be in accordance with the provision of Public Law, No. 846, Seventy-fourth Congress, approved June 30, 1936.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That completes the committee amendments, with the exception of the one passed over.

Mr. WALSH. That leaves the first amendment, in section 1.

Mr. NYE. Has the amendment on page 5, consisting of striking out section 6 of the House bill and inserting a new section 6, been adopted?

Mr. WALSH. Yes.

Mr. NYE. I should like to know just what is intended under that amendment.

Mr. WALSH. I shall be glad to explain the amendment. Section 6 of the House bill was struck out, and a new section 6 was substituted by the Senate committee. The House provision contained three authorizations, in the following language:

SEC. 6. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of \$15,000,000 to be expended at the direction of the President of the United States for purposes of experimenting with surface craft, lighter-than-air craft, heavier-than-air craft, aerial bombs, aerial mines, torpedoes, and other inventions and material developments for the national defense, of which sum \$5,000,000 shall be expended for the construction of experimental vessels, none of which shall exceed 3,000 tons standard displacement, and \$3,000,000 of which shall be expended for the construction of a rigid airship of American design and American construction of a capacity not to exceed 3,000,000 cubic feet either fabric covered or metal covered to be used for training, experimental, and development purposes.

Then there was a proviso to which I shall refer in a moment. It will be noted that the House authorized \$15,000,000 for experimental purposes, to be used at the discretion of the President, \$3,000,000 of which was to be for an airship.

In addition to the items I have read—namely, \$15,000,000 for experimental purposes, \$3,000,000 of which was to be for

an airship, and \$5,000,000 for the construction of experimental vessels—in the House bill there was a proviso reading as follows:

Provided, That the Secretary of the Navy is hereby authorized to enter into contracts with inventors and manufacturers for experimental work, models, plans, materials, and the development of projects useful to the national defense to the extent of \$15,000,000 in addition to the sum authorized by this section to be appropriated.

Therefore we had \$15,000,000 for experimenting with surface craft, lighter-than-air craft, heavier-than-air craft, and so forth, \$5,000,000 of which was to be expended for the construction of small surface vessels, and \$3,000,000 of which was to be expended for the construction of an airship. In addition, there was \$15,000,000 to permit the Navy Department to enter into contracts with inventors and manufacturers for experimental work, models, plans, and so forth. The Senate committee amendment strikes out the second \$15,000,000 and strikes out \$3,000,000 for the airship, leaving the first \$15,000,000, but confining it to experiments in only one field, namely, the construction of experimental vessels, none of which shall exceed 3,000 tons standard displacement.

The testimony before the committee was that the Navy Department needs no authorization whatever for experimental purposes. Under the provisions of the general law, the Navy Department can come to Congress at any time and obtain an appropriation for such purposes. Therefore no such provision is necessary in this bill.

The second committee amendment retains the first \$15,000,000, but limits it to one field of experimentation. The Navy Department needs an authorization practically only for the construction of vessels. It will be noticed that the bill specifically authorizes the construction of certain types of vessels with specified tonnages. The first \$15,000,000 is limited to experimentation in the field of small vessels, none of which shall exceed 3,000 tons standard displacement. Such vessels would be small, fast vessels, of about 120 feet in length.

For some time the Navy Department has been disturbed, in its program of defense, by the lack of defense in our harbors and on our shores, in the event the Navy is at sea and an attack is made by submarines which cannot be reached by the shore defense guns.

They have been experimenting with vessels of reasonably small dimensions that would be able to attack submarines. There is a suggestion that there may be developed a type of vessel having great speed and apparatus designed to attack submarines that could go very close and drop a bomb and destroy the submarine. In any event, the Senate committee felt, as the members of the House committee felt, though they went into a larger and broader field, that it was a worth-while undertaking to authorize an appropriation of \$15,000,000 for experimenting with what would be not a fleet combatant vessel but a harbor defense vessel. Without such vessel if we were engaged in conflict with the enemy and all our fleet were at sea, the harbors would be unprotected or we would have to bring back our destroyers and keep them in the harbors and therefore lessen the strength and the power of our fleet. So this is an effort to develop and construct a type of vessel that will be purely and solely a harbor protection vessel. It is proposed to build a type which could be produced very rapidly in case of emergency.

Mr. DUFFY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WALSH. I yield.

Mr. DUFFY. Is there any interpretation to be placed upon the action of the committee in striking out the provision for experimentation with lighter-than-air craft and other specific things and simply providing \$15,000,000 for experimental vessels? Is it to be interpreted that by that action the committee disapproves of any experimentation along the line of the other items?

Mr. WALSH. Yes; it is.

Mr. DUFFY. Is that the interpretation?

Mr. WALSH. Yes; but I want to speak of the \$3,000,000 item in the House bill for the construction of a rigid airship.

I have always had much trouble about airships and lighter-than-air craft. It is a most fascinating subject, and it is very difficult to know what to do at this time. The House decided to provide, out of the \$15,000,000, the sum of \$3,000,000 for the construction of a dirigible, or lighter-than-air ship, of the proportions mentioned in the bill. After 16 years' experimentation in lighter-than-air craft, we have now quite a number of blimps at the naval station at Lakehurst, some balloons, and one lighter-than-air ship called the *Los Angeles*, which has a capacity of about 3,000,000 cubic feet. It is a lighter-than-air ship used for training; it is getting old and is not being flown at the present time.

The House thought that we ought to build another ship of the same proportions and size. The Senate committee gave a great deal of attention and consideration to the matter. We thought, first of all, because of the fact that there is not today any military power in the world using lighter-than-air craft—perhaps for the reason that they have not the helium gas—that we did not need them. I think that was the controlling factor in the judgment of the committee in eliminating the provision, namely, that we did not need to venture into a new field of naval weapon that is not in use by other countries, and, in view of our unfortunate experiences involving the loss of life and loss of airships in the past we ought to take a holiday for a time and not build any of these ships.

Mr. DUFFY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield there?

Mr. WALSH. I yield.

Mr. DUFFY. In view of the Senator's previous statement about the Navy not needing authority to make experiments of various kinds, is it the Senator's idea that the Navy, however, would need specific authority in order to build lighter-than-air craft?

Mr. WALSH. The Navy would need such authority. Perhaps I was a little careless in the statement I made, for I meant to say that in connection with experiments if a man comes with a patent or a new idea the Navy does not need authority to negotiate with him and contract with him; it can come here and say, "We have got this idea and it is valuable and we want the money for it"; but for the building and construction of airships it is necessary to obtain authority from Congress.

Commander Rosendahl is the one officer in the Navy who has achieved great reputation for his knowledge of lighter-than-air craft. He is a very sincere, high-minded, efficient, capable officer, of whom any American may well be proud. America will be forever indebted to him for his contribution to the development of this science; and some day, I think, if lighter-than-air craft become a useful and efficient means of travel or a sufficiently powerful military weapon, there might properly be a monument erected to him. He wanted us to go further. He was full of zeal for this undertaking; he believes in lighter-than-air craft; he is convinced that lighter-than-air craft is bound to come sooner or later. So we were very much troubled about it.

We did not think that by not appropriating the \$3,000,000 we would be surrendering all that we had gained, including the lessons learned from the great losses we have sustained in this field of which the Senate knows and of which I need not remind them, the disasters that have occurred, one after another, due to structural or other faults.

That is the one thing that troubled us. Should we now close the doors forever and get entirely out of the field or should we carry on even with an appropriation of only \$3,000,000 and put the men, some of whom have been trained for 16 years in this work, into the further development of lighter-than-air craft and perhaps have the same experiences we have had in the past?

I hope the Senate will permit its conferees, when this bill goes into conference, to give very serious consideration to the House provision on that matter, because the appropriation is only \$3,000,000 out of \$15,000,000, and I should like

to feel at liberty, unless instructed otherwise by my colleagues, to give especial attention and consideration to this further experimentation.

Mr. DUFFY. Mr. President—

Mr. WALSH. I will yield in a moment. Commander Rosendahl wanted two more vessels of the larger dirigible type, two 10,000-ton airships costing about \$8,000,000 apiece. He favors and believes strongly in such dirigibles to operate in the air as aircraft carriers. They would have something in the nature of a ladder or hook attachment on which six or seven airplanes could be carried which could be released at any time and being high in the air could obtain a momentum and speed that they could not get if started from land, and could carry more bombs and heavier weight.

Commander Rosendahl is very earnest and very serious and very anxious to have us enter upon that undertaking. Admiral Cook, who is the head of the Bureau of Aeronautics, was in sympathy with him, but did not press the matter strenuously. The committee felt, inasmuch as the problem is so difficult and there is such a wide division of opinion regarding it, that we ought not to appropriate money for two larger dirigibles, and we finally removed the provision for the lighter-than-air ship costing \$3,000,000 from the bill, but not because of the fact that we did not believe it would be of sufficient military value. As I said before, I think if we knew the item would not remain open and would not be a matter for discussion in conference, we probably would have voted to put it in the bill.

I now yield to the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. DUFFY. I may say to the Senator that very careful investigation was made 2 or 3 years ago by a joint committee of the House and Senate after the disaster to the *Akron*, and after careful consideration I think the committees, representing both Houses, felt that there was a considerable field for lighter-than-air craft that should be further explored. The idea of being able to release and pick up planes at sea is not entirely theoretical. Both the *Akron* and the *Macon*, as I recall—certainly it is true of the *Macon*—were so constructed that they could carry airplanes three or four hundred miles to sea, and the airplanes could then leave the mother vessel and in turn could scout a large area and return. The mechanics of the operation had been worked out.

So I think experimentation with lighter-than-air craft should not be too lightly passed over, for in them lies a real possibility of defense. I do not think lighter-than-air craft are worth anything as a matter of offense—even though the Germans used them during the World War—with the speed fighting planes now have, but, as a matter of scouting and as a defense, I think there is a real possibility of advantage in their use being found by further investigation.

Mr. WALSH. The Senator has made a constructive and valuable statement in connection with this subject. If we had thought this action would end the question of what our policy should be in regard to lighter-than-air craft, we might not have taken the action we did take. We felt that it was not such a precedent, or so important, or so necessary to incorporate it in the bill at this time as to justify raising a discussion here and there as to the wisdom of building lighter-than-air craft, which, as the Senator knows, is a highly controversial question.

Does that answer the Senator's question with regard to that amendment, which, I understand, has been adopted?

Mr. LUNDEEN. I should like to have the amendment go over until tomorrow.

Mr. WALSH. The amendment has already been adopted. The vote on it would have to be reconsidered in order to have the amendment go over until tomorrow. I have no objection to reconsideration, if the Senator wants to have that done. Does he not think, however, that the Senate has rendered a service in saving \$15,000,000 in connection with this amendment?

Mr. LUNDEEN. I do not. I believe that expenditure of \$3,000,000 for a rigid airship would be wise.

Mr. WALSH. The other \$15,000,000?

Mr. LUNDEEN. I do not say that. I am referring now more particularly to the \$3,000,000. I think it should be given further consideration, and I did not understand that the amendment had been adopted.

Mr. WALSH. I ask unanimous consent that the amendment which was adopted on page 6, being section 6 of the bill, be reconsidered, and remain without action.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McGILL in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. LUNDEEN. I appreciate the Senator's action.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the first amendment passed over. The amendment in question, on page 2, was passed over at the request of the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. Nye].

Mr. NYE. Mr. President, the amendment known as section 6 also was passed over. Except for those two amendments, the committee amendments have been adopted by the Senate, as I understand.

Mr. WALSH. The only amendments left for action now are the amendment on page 2, section 1, relating to capital ships and aircraft carriers, and that on page 6, known as section 6.

Now let me very briefly recapitulate the situation. May the amendment which is now before the Senate be stated?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 2 it is proposed to strike out lines 3 to 8, inclusive, and to insert in lieu thereof the following:

(a) Capital ships, 135,000 tons, making a total authorized under-age tonnage of 660,000 tons;

(b) Aircraft carriers, 40,000 tons, making a total authorized under-age tonnage of 175,000 tons;

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, that amendment does not increase the number of battleships authorized in the bill. It does not increase the number of aircraft carriers. Let that be understood. Just the same number is authorized. There is no increase, but both of the paragraphs give an option to the President to determine whether, in the interest of national defense, it is better to have three battleships of 45,000 tons, or three battleships of 35,000 tons, or one of 45,000 tons and two of 35,000 tons, or two of 45,000 tons and one of 35,000 tons, than to have what the House bill provides, confining the new construction solely and alone to 35,000-ton battleships.

In other words, we say, "The responsibility is yours. We will give you the authorization." Of course, the Navy Department will have to come before Congress and ask for the necessary appropriations, and then the whole matter can be thrashed out here. We have only given them a limitation of tonnage, so that they will not be confined, when they come before the committee, to battleships of 35,000 tons and no more.

In regard to the airplane carriers, we have not increased the number, but we have given an option, because aircraft carriers are new types of vessels. That is almost a new field of naval construction. Some persons think that the first two aircraft carriers we built, the *Lexington* and *Saratoga*, which were made over from battle cruisers, are the best aircraft carriers we have, and that the 15,000-ton aircraft carriers that we have built recently are not as satisfactory as the 20,000-ton ships. The pending bill as reported from the Senate committee says, "If you want to do so, you may build aircraft carriers of 20,000 tons, but you may build only two. We will not confine you to vessels of 15,000 tons, for in that event you might come around in 5 or 10 years and say, 'You confined us to vessels of 15,000 tons. We wanted to build vessels of 20,000 tons, but you would not permit us to do so, and now we have not the kind of aircraft we need.'"

With that explanation I leave the subject.

Mr. HALE. Mr. President, I think the Senator should make it clear that when he says we have not increased the number of battleships or the number of aircraft carriers, he means we have not increased them over the House bill.

Mr. WALSH. Exactly; the Senator is right.

Mr. HALE. Of course, we have increased them over the provisions of the Vinson-Trammell Act.

Mr. WALSH. I was making a comparison between the House bill and the bill as reported from the Senate committee.

Mr. LEWIS. Mr. President, let me ask my friend the eminent chairman of the Naval Affairs Committee if it is understood that the provisions in which the able Senator from North Dakota [Mr. NYE] is interested shall go over until tomorrow?

Mr. WALSH. I thought perhaps the Senator was going to speak this afternoon.

Mr. LEWIS. I thought he desired to have the matter go over until tomorrow, and for that reason I was communicating to the Senator from Massachusetts his wishes.

Mr. WALSH. Otherwise there is nothing for us to do today, unless some Senator wishes to ask questions regarding the bill.

Mr. NYE. Mr. President, I very much dislike to start in at this hour when I realize that inside of half an hour the Senate will be prepared to adjourn until tomorrow. I wonder if we cannot have an adjournment at this time.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, we all know that we have a great deal of work to do if Congress is to adjourn at the time we hope to have it adjourn. I think we shall have to adopt the policy of continuing the sessions certainly later than 4:20 o'clock if we are to accomplish our purposes. I do not want to insist on the Senator from North Dakota speaking this afternoon if he cannot finish his remarks today.

Mr. NYE. I could not hope to do so.

Mr. BARKLEY. A considerable part of the time tomorrow, as we know, will be taken up by services in honor of our late distinguished leader, the former Senator from Arkansas, Mr. Robinson.

Outside of the matter to which the Senator from North Dakota is to address himself, may I ask what other controversial matter remains in the bill?

Mr. WALSH. There is nothing left of a controversial nature except this one item, and that is a very narrow one; but I assume that the Senator from North Dakota, and perhaps other Senators, will wish to speak on the bill as a whole.

Mr. NYE. I may say that several Senators do.

Mr. WALSH. Can any of them speak tonight?

Mr. NYE. I see none of them present, and I do not know that any are prepared. Certainly none would want to begin their remarks at this time of day.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I am willing to move an adjournment now until tomorrow; but I serve notice that Senators will have to be ready, so far as possible, to continue here until 5 o'clock at least for the remainder of the present session of Congress, because that will be necessary if we are to conclude the business of the session. Five o'clock is not an unreasonable hour of adjournment.

Mr. NYE. I quite agree with the Senator that it is not an unreasonable hour of adjournment; but I should very much dislike to start my remarks now, knowing that an adjournment will be taken so soon.

Mr. BARKLEY. I shall move an adjournment now, with the understanding that tomorrow at 2 o'clock we are to begin the memorial service, and that from the time we meet until that hour we shall go on with this bill.

Mr. NYE. Very well.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. BARKLEY. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McGILL in the chair) laid before the Senate messages from the President of the

United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

Mr. McKELLAR, from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads, reported favorably the nominations of sundry postmasters.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah, from the Committee on Education and Labor, reported favorably the nomination of Charles J. Maxcy, of New Jersey, as Director of Finance and Accounts Division of the United States Housing Authority.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The reports will be placed on the Executive Calendar.

If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will state in their order the nominations on the calendar.

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Spruille Braden, of New York, to be Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary to Colombia.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

POSTMASTERS

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of postmasters.

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask unanimous consent that the nominations of postmasters be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations of postmasters are confirmed en bloc. That completes the Executive Calendar.

DEATH OF REPRESENTATIVE COLDEN, OF CALIFORNIA

The Senate resumed legislative session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair lays before the Senate resolutions from the House of Representatives, which will be read.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the House has heard with profound sorrow of the death of Hon. CHARLES J. COLDEN, a Representative from the State of California.

Resolved, That a committee of four Members of the House, with such Members of the Senate as may be joined, be appointed to attend the funeral.

Resolved, That the Sergeant at Arms of the House be authorized and directed to take such steps as may be necessary for carrying out the provisions of these resolutions and that the necessary expenses in connection therewith be paid out of the contingent fund of the House.

Resolved, That the Clerk communicate these resolutions to the Senate and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

Resolved, That as a further mark of respect the House do now adjourn.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. President, I send to the desk resolutions which I ask to have read and immediately considered.

The resolutions (S. Res. 268) were read, considered by unanimous consent, and unanimously agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Senate has heard with profound sorrow the announcement of the death of Hon. CHARLES J. COLDEN, late a Representative from the State of California.

Resolved, That a committee of two Senators be appointed by the President of the Senate to join the committee appointed on the part of the House of Representatives to attend the funeral of the deceased Representative.

Resolved, That the Secretary communicate these resolutions to the House of Representatives and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the second resolution the Chair appoints the senior Senator from California [Mr. JOHNSON] and the junior Senator from California [Mr. McADOO] as the committee on the part of the Senate.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. As a further mark of respect to the memory of the deceased Representative, I move that the Senate stand adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock noon.

The motion was unanimously agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 30 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, April 20, 1938, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

*Executive nominations received by the Senate April 19
(legislative day of January 5), 1938*

FARM SECURITY ADMINISTRATION

Harry S. Muir, of Minneapolis, to be Regional Director of the Farm Security Administration, Department of Agriculture.

APPOINTMENTS, BY TRANSFER, IN THE REGULAR ARMY

TO QUARTERMASTER CORPS

Maj. Edward Avery Austin, Infantry, with rank from August 1, 1935, effective September 5, 1938.

Maj. Earl LeVerne Lyons, Infantry, with rank from August 1, 1935.

Capt. Harry Edwin Magnuson, Coast Artillery Corps, with rank from August 1, 1935.

Second Lt. Theodore Janof, Infantry, with rank from June 12, 1936, effective July 1, 1938.

TO FIELD ARTILLERY

First Lt. Harold Webb Browning, Infantry, with rank from June 12, 1937, effective June 16, 1938.

PROMOTIONS IN THE REGULAR ARMY

MEDICAL CORPS

To be colonels

Lt. Col. Shelley Uriah Marietta, Medical Corps, from May 1, 1938.

Lt. Col. Robert Skelton, Medical Corps, from May 3, 1938.

Lt. Col. Omar Heinrich Quade, Medical Corps, from May 4, 1938.

Lt. Col. Thomas Ewing Scott, Medical Corps, from May 5, 1938.

Lt. Col. Thomas Everett Harwood, Jr., Medical Corps, from May 9, 1938.

Lt. Col. Samuel Jay Turnbull, Medical Corps, from May 11, 1938.

Lt. Col. Michael Andrew Dailey, Medical Corps, from May 12, 1938.

Lt. Col. Alvin Charles Miller, Medical Corps, from May 18, 1938.

Lt. Col. Chester Raymond Haig, Medical Corps, from May 19, 1938.

Lt. Col. William Eugene Hall, Medical Corps, from May 21, 1938.

Lt. Col. Hew Bernard McMurdo, Medical Corps, from May 22, 1938.

Lt. Col. Thomas Ward Burnett, Medical Corps, from May 23, 1938.

Lt. Col. Robert Morris Hardaway, Medical Corps, from May 25, 1938.

Lt. Col. John Wesley Sherwood, Medical Corps, from May 26, 1938.

Lt. Col. Guy Logan Qualls, Medical Corps, from May 27, 1938.

Lt. Col. James Ernest Baylis, Medical Corps, from May 28, 1938.

Lt. Col. Douglas Wiltz McEnery, Medical Corps, from May 30, 1938.

Lt. Col. John William Meehan, Medical Corps, from May 31, 1938.

To be lieutenant colonel

Maj. Ralph Ellis Murrell, Medical Corps, from May 7, 1938.

To be captains

First Lt. Weldon Kenneth Ruth, Medical Corps, from May 1, 1938.

First Lt. Gus Warlick Neece, Medical Corps, from May 10, 1938.

First Lt. Ryle August Radke, Medical Corps, from May 18, 1938.

DENTAL CORPS

To be colonels

Lt. Col. William Archer Squires, Dental Corps, from May 13, 1938.

Lt. Col. Arnett Percy Matthews, Dental Corps, from May 14, 1938.

To be lieutenant colonels

Maj. Herman James Lambert, Dental Corps, from May 13, 1938.

Maj. James Barrett Mockbee, Dental Corps, from May 22, 1938.

Maj. Page Purnell Albert Chesser, Dental Corps, from May 29, 1938.

To be captain

First Lt. Hutton A. Shearer, Dental Corps, from May 8, 1938.

VETERINARY CORPS

To be captain

First Lt. Walter Smit, Veterinary Corps, from May 1, 1938.

MEDICAL ADMINISTRATIVE CORPS

To be captain

First Lt. Edward James Gearin, Medical Administrative Corps, from May 18, 1938.

CHAPLAIN

To be chaplain with the rank of major

Chaplain James Hugh O'Neill (captain), United States Army, from May 11, 1938.

CONFIRMATIONS

*Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate April 19
(legislative day of January 5), 1938*

ENVOY EXTRAORDINARY AND MINISTER PLENIPOTENTIARY

Spruille Braden to be Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Colombia.

POSTMASTERS

CONNECTICUT

Florence W. Latham, Eastford.

Matthew F. Geary, Uncasville.

INDIANA

Jennette R. Winkelmann, Austin.

George W. Purcell, Bloomington.

Charles L. Wolford, Linton.

Lueldo R. Davis, Marengo.

MISSISSIPPI

Ivy G. Hill, Cleveland.

Fletcher H. Womack, Crenshaw.

Joseph W. George, Greenwood.

George D. Pylant, Purvis.

Lillie B. Carr, Sumner.

MISSOURI

Leslie B. Kincaid, Braymer.

Max Clodfelter, Dexter.

Thomas F. Herndon, Hume.

Willie D. Groom, Kearney.

Louis N. Bowman, King City.

Charles E. Sears, Macon.

Ruth Vandiver, Orrick.

Rosa M. Hall, Parma.

Leonard D. Dyer, Rushville.

William B. Maus, Schell City.

NEBRASKA

Louis C. Kuster, Tecumseh.

VIRGINIA

M. Estes Cocke, Hollins College.

WASHINGTON

Pearl B. Burrill, Snoqualmie Falls.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, APRIL 19, 1938

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Rev. Thomas E. Flynn, St. Mary's, Chorley, Lancashire, England, offered the following prayer:

O Lord Jesus Christ, who in the glory of Thy resurrection didst appear to Thy distracted disciples saying, "My peace I give unto you," deign to be with us now who are struggling in the darkness of the world which too often forgettest Thee and grant Thy peace to us. May the Paraclete, the Comforter, whom Thou didst promise the spirit of wisdom, be with us in all our deliberations and save us from being deflected either to the right hand or to the left by private interests or by acceptance of persons, so that we may always pursue our duties in a straight line toward Thy glory and honor. O Lord Jesus Christ, grant that we may ever remember our responsibility as representatives of a great and peace-loving nation and do what in us lie to promote peace and justice and love among our own people, hoping that thereby we may contribute to the happiness of the world at large. Send forth Thy spirit and they shall be created and Thou shalt renew the face of the earth. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

SUNDRY MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Sundry messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the House by Mr. Latta, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House that on the following dates the President approved and signed bills of the House of the following titles:

On April 14, 1938:

H. R. 3776. An act for the relief of T. T. East and the Cassidy Southwestern Commission Co., citizens of the State of Texas.

On April 15, 1938:

H. R. 7448. An act to provide for experimental air-mail services to further develop safety, efficiency, and economy, and for other purposes.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments, in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 1531. An act extending the classified civil service to include postmasters of the first, second, and third classes, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the foregoing bill, requests a conference with the House thereon, and appoints Mr. McKELLAR, Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. O'MAHONEY, Mr. LA FOLLETTE, and Mr. LOGAN to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate recedes from its amendment No. 28 to the bill (H. R. 8837) making appropriations for the Executive Office and sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1939, and for other purposes, still further insists upon its amendments Nos. 24, 26, 27, and 37, asks a still further conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. GLASS, Mr. BYRNES, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. ADAMS, and Mr. HALE to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed a bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 3684. An act to provide for the holding of terms of the District Courts of the United States for West Virginia at Fairmont and Beckley.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MEAD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD on the reorganization bill.

The SPEAKER. Without objection it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include a radio address I delivered on Sunday.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. SHAFER of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD at this point and to include therein a copy of a resolution received by me from the Chicago Livestock Exchange, and also a resolution of my own which I am introducing this morning.

The SPEAKER. Without objection it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. SHAFER of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I rise to place in the RECORD a resolution dated April 14, 1938, copy of which was sent me by the Chicago Livestock Exchange, in which it is charged that the different Departments having jurisdiction over C. C. C. camps, have lately been purchasing abroad, particularly in South America, considerable quantities of canned meats for their C. C. C. camps and other agencies:

Whereas prosperity of the livestock industry depends in large part upon the amount of consumption in the United States of domestic meats; and

Whereas advice has been received by the members of the Chicago Livestock Exchange that our Federal Government has lately purchased abroad, and particularly from South America, considerable quantities of canned meats for their C. C. C. camps and other agencies; and

Whereas the members of the Chicago Livestock Exchange are sure that such a policy and practice on the part of our Federal Government is highly injurious to the producers, farmers, feeders, and shippers of livestock throughout the United States; and

Therefore the members of the Chicago Livestock Exchange in convention assembled, most emphatically condemn such a practice and policy on the part of our Federal Government, and most respectfully urge the President of the United States, the members of his Cabinet, the heads of the interested Departments of the Government, and the Members of Congress to cease and desist from such practice and policy; and

Further urge that the President of the United States, the members of his Cabinet, the heads of the interested Departments of the Government, and the Members of Congress insist that in future purchases of meats for C. C. C. camps and other agencies and activities of the Government, the Government purchasing agents confine themselves entirely to the purchase of domestic-produced meats; and

Further, that copies of this resolution be forwarded by the secretary of the exchange to the President of the United States, members of his Cabinet, heads of the interested Departments, and all Members of Congress.

It must seem incredible to the Members of this House, as it is incredible to me, that while we are restricting agricultural production on the ground that overproduction of farm commodities, which certainly include meat products, is resulting from a lack of consumer demand, that governmental Departments should be purchasing canned meats for the use of these C. C. C. camps and other agencies from foreign producers.

There could be no excuse whatsoever for this action on the basis of price, because even though such products might be secured abroad at a lower price than they could be secured from our own producers, certainly the administration's own proposals that we spend vast sums of money to restore employment, to lend to small business, and to relieve jobless citizens of privation until work can be provided for them, is in itself a sufficient argument against any such outrageous procedure as this appears to be.

The only possible reason that I can imagine to excuse such an action as this, if these charges be true, would be that there existed in this country such a shortage of meat products that these supplies were not procurable in the United States. If that situation does exist, then certainly any limitation on corn production, livestock production, and on the processing of domestic meats could not possibly be justified.

I shall at the end of my remarks, Mr. Speaker, introduce a resolution calling upon the cooperative agencies under which the C. C. C. camps are operated, namely, the Department

of Agriculture, Department of Labor, Department of the Interior, and Department of War, instructing them forthwith to prepare and transmit to this House a complete statement of all such purchases made from foreign producers, giving the dates thereof, the prices paid, the total amount spent in such transactions, together with a full statement as to the reasons for such purchases of goods from other than American producers.

Mr. Speaker, unless there is a very valid reason for this action on the part of these departments, and as I have said the only possible reason I can imagine would be such a shortage of meat products in this country that the Government actually cannot procure its necessary supplies from our domestic producers, then such a practice as this can prove to be highly injurious to our domestic producers, farmers, feeders, and shippers of livestock.

Certainly the administration is as fully aware of the necessity for providing the greatest possible amount of business at home for our own producers of agricultural products, as are the Members of this Congress.

I am tempted to say more on this subject, but I shall refrain from doing so until such time as this information which is requested in the resolution I shall now introduce has been transmitted to this House. I call upon my colleagues in this body to pass this resolution. If these charges are untrue, that fact should be established. If these charges are true, then certainly this Congress should immediately put itself in possession of the reasons behind such an incredible procedure. If these supplies are procurable from our domestic producers, then whatever action is necessary to put a stop to this business of purchasing such supplies from foreign producers should be taken. In any event there cannot be the slightest objection to this House moving by this resolution to secure this information forthwith.

My resolution reads:

Whereas it is alleged by a resolution dated April 14, 1938, passed by the members of the Chicago Livestock Exchange in convention assembled, that considerable quantities of canned meats have been purchased from South America for the C. C. C. camps and other Government agencies; and

Whereas if these charges are founded on fact the prosperity of the livestock industry of the United States is being injured by such practices; and

Whereas such a practice is highly injurious to producers, farmers, feeders, and shippers of livestock throughout the United States; and

Whereas under present conditions obtaining in the United States all supplies of this character procurable from our own producers should be purchased at home; and

Whereas this practice of purchasing from foreign producers may be more extensive than is now known: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Department of Agriculture, Department of Labor, Department of the Interior, and the Department of War be, and they are hereby, instructed immediately to prepare and transmit to the House of Representatives a complete statement of any and all supplies and goods of any and every character whatsoever which have at any time in the past 5 years been purchased from producers in any country other than the United States by these departments for the use of C. C. C. camps under their jurisdiction, or for any other activities over which they have jurisdiction.

Such reports shall include the character of such purchases, dates thereof, amounts thereof, the prices paid therefor, and the total amounts spent in such transactions, together with a full statement as to the reasons for such purchases of goods from other than American producers.

BOXWOOD HALL, ELIZABETH, N. J.

Mr. McLEAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. McLEAN. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced a bill the purpose of which is to preserve as a national shrine the colonial mansion house in Elizabeth, N. J., known as Boxwood Hall. It was the home of Elias Boudinot, and afterward Jonathan Dayton.

Boxwood Hall was owned and probably built by Samuel Woodruff, mayor of the town before 1763—some claim 1750—and was the center of many important gatherings and events of colonial days. During the Revolution it was the home of Hon. Elias Boudinot. He was one of our great Revolutionary statesmen. He was of French ancestry; a counselor at law, and a trustee of Princeton University.

He was an important factor in all the events leading up to the Declaration of Independence, and was closely associated with Washington throughout the War for Independence. He was a delegate to the Continental Congress, serving as its president, and acting as secretary of foreign affairs. He signed the treaties of peace with Great Britain and of alliance with the French King; proclaimed cessation of hostilities, thanksgiving, discharging the Army, and removal of the Congress to Princeton, and presided at the session in Nassau Hall when Washington was thanked for his services "in establishing the freedom and independence of your country." He was the first counselor named by the United States Supreme Court. Jonathan Dayton was a son of a Revolutionary officer, and was himself an officer in the Revolutionary Army—one of the youngest. He was a delegate to the Constitutional Convention and was a signer of the Constitution of the United States. He served in the Continental Congress, the New Jersey Legislature, in the House of Representatives of the United States—as its Speaker in the first session of the fourth Congress from December 7, 1795, to June 1, 1796—and in the United States Senate. He was one of those who migrated to the West and contributed to its development. What is now the city of Dayton, Ohio, was named in his honor. His remains are interred beneath the vestry room of St. John's Church in Elizabeth.

Boxwood Hall, sometimes called the Boudinot mansion, is now owned by an organization composed of public-spirited women who have used it for some years as a home for aged women. Their work has been so successful and the demands upon them so great that they have found it necessary to provide larger and more modern quarters, and if Boxwood Hall is not acquired for patriotic purposes it will be sold to private investors and its historical sentiments and patriotic inspiration lost to the community and the Nation. The generosity of the present owners make it possible to acquire the property at this time at a nominal cost. The house is an excellent example of colonial architecture, both inside and out, and is in a perfect state of preservation. Its location is near the heart of the city on an important thoroughfare, which was one of the main highways of travel to the principal ferry leading from all parts of the South and West to the city of New York. On the stone steps at the front of the house, in 1781, was placed the murdered body of the Reverend James Caldwell, chaplain in the Army, that it might be viewed by the people; over it Boudinot made a powerful address. The Marquis de Lafayette was a guest here in 1824. General Washington, on his journey to New York for his inauguration as the first President of the United States, passed through Elizabeth to take the ferry at Elizabethport and was met at Boxwood Hall by a committee of Congress. An elaborate luncheon was served, attended by many of the important men and women of the land. To celebrate the one hundred and fiftieth anniversary of that event a pageant reenacting the arrival and departure of General Washington on that day has been arranged under the auspices of the United States Constitution Sesquicentennial Commission.

Alexander Hamilton was a frequent visitor at Boxwood Hall. Elizabeth was the first place he lived after being sent to America to complete his education, and in his active political life the opportunity to consult with leading men of his day—among them William Livingston and William Paterson, those two great minds who so materially aided in the formation of the Constitution and who lived nearby—made him a frequent guest at Boxwood Hall.

These are only a few of the important facts which justify the preservation of Boxwood Hall as a national shrine. Should it be made available for the purpose, the State of New Jersey will include it in its program of preservation of historical sites, and many of the patriotic citizens of Elizabeth and vicinity will contribute appropriate furniture and other mementoes which will restore Boxwood Hall as it was in colonial days.

I speak today for the Governor of New Jersey, the State senator and members of the New Jersey Legislature from

Union County, and the mayor of the city of Elizabeth, all of whom have communicated with me in behalf of the project, and for the patriotic societies, principally the Daughters of the American Revolution and the American Legion posts, and the Union County Historical Society. My suggestion is that the Congress of the United States shall by the appropriation of funds for the purchase of Boxwood Hall give its endorsement to the movement for its preservation. [Applause.]

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES—THIRD PAN AMERICAN HIGHWAY CONFERENCE, SANTIAGO, CHILE

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs:

To the Congress of the United States:

I commend to the favorable consideration of the Congress the enclosed report from the Secretary of State to the end that legislation may be enacted authorizing an appropriation of the sum of \$15,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, for the expenses of participation by the United States in the Third Pan American Highway Conference, to be held at Santiago, Chile, in September 1938.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, April 19, 1938.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES—INTERNATIONAL UNION OF GEODESY AND GEOPHYSICS

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs:

To the Congress of the United States:

I commend to the favorable consideration of the Congress the enclosed report from the Secretary of State to the end that legislation may be enacted authorizing and requesting the President of the United States to invite the International Union of Geodesy and Geophysics to hold its Seventh General Assembly in the United States during the calendar year 1939, and to invite foreign governments to participate in that general assembly; and authorizing an appropriation of \$5,000 to assist in meeting the expenses necessary for participation by the United States in the meeting.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, April 19, 1938.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE APPROPRIATION BILL, 1939

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 10238) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture and for the Farm Credit Administration for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1939, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 10238, the Department of Agriculture appropriation bill, 1939, with Mr. NELSON in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 10 minutes at the conclusion of the reading of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, when the Committee rose last Thursday there remained to be read the section on the Bureau of Public Roads, beginning at page 69, the consideration of which was passed over by consent of the Committee. I ask that the Clerk read this section.

The Clerk read as follows:

FEDERAL-AID HIGHWAY SYSTEM

For carrying out the provisions of the act entitled "An act to provide that the United States shall aid the States in the

construction of rural post roads, and for other purposes," approved July 11, 1916 (39 Stat. 355-359), and all acts amendatory thereof and supplementary thereto, to be expended in accordance with the provisions of said act, as amended, including not to exceed \$1,120,000 for departmental personal services in the District of Columbia, \$63,000,000, to be immediately available and to remain available until expended, which sum is a part of the sum of \$125,000,000, authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year 1938, by section 1 of the act approved June 16, 1936 (49 Stat. 1519-1520): *Provided*, That none of the money herein appropriated shall be paid to any State on account of any project on which convict labor shall be employed, except this provision shall not apply to convict labor performed by convicts on parole or probation: *Provided further*, That not to exceed \$45,000 of the funds provided for carrying out the provisions of the Federal Highway Act of November 9, 1921 (23 U. S. C. 21, 23), shall be available for the purchase of motor-propelled passenger-carrying vehicles necessary for carrying out the provisions of said act, including the replacement of not to exceed one such vehicle for use in the administrative work of the Bureau of Public Roads in the District of Columbia at a cost, including the exchange value of the vehicle to be replaced, not to exceed \$1,200: *Provided further*, That during the fiscal year 1939, whenever performing authorized engineering or other services in connection with the survey, construction, and maintenance, or improvement of roads for other Government agencies the charge for such services may include depreciation on engineering and road-building equipment used, and the amounts received on account of such charges shall be credited to the appropriation concerned: *Provided further*, That during the fiscal year 1939 the appropriations for the work of the Bureau of Public Roads shall be available for meeting the expenses of warehouse maintenance and the procurement, care, and handling of supplies, materials, and equipment stored therein for distribution to projects under the supervision of the Bureau of Public Roads, and for sale and distribution to other Government activities, the cost of such supplies and materials or the value of such equipment (including the cost of transportation and handling) to be reimbursed to appropriations current at the time additional supplies, materials, or equipment are procured, from the appropriation chargeable with the cost or value of such supplies, materials, or equipment: *Provided further*, That the appropriations available to the Bureau of Public Roads may be used in emergency for medical supplies and services and other assistance necessary for the immediate relief of employees engaged on hazardous work under that Bureau.

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the language beginning on line 23, page 70, starting with the words "*Provided further*" and ending on line 7, page 71, with the sign and figures "\$1,200", that it is not authorized by law.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, the point of order raised by the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. CARTWRIGHT] involves the same question raised by the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] on last Thursday just before the Committee rose.

At that time the Committee of the Whole was considering an appropriation for general administrative purposes of the Beltsville Research Center, and the gentleman from New York made the point of order that a proviso carried in the paragraph for the purchase of an automobile was not authorized by law.

I cited the statute and reminded the Chair that a similar point of order made by the gentleman from New York against a paragraph in the same bill last year had been overruled and referred him to the Parliamentarian for the specific citation. But as the Parliamentarian did not recall the decision and I was unable to give the exact page at the time, the Chair held:

The Chair is ready to rule.

In the absence of specific citation, the Chair sustains the point of order. The proviso is stricken out.

This decision is so far reaching in its effect and is such a departure from the established procedure of the House, and affects so vitally the future consideration of all annual appropriation bills, that we venture to again raise the question at this time in the hope that the Chair, on further reflection, will reconsider his decision. With that in view, we submit for the consideration of the Chair the decision to which I referred last Thursday, reported in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of April 23, 1937—almost a year ago—at page 3783.

That one decision is in itself conclusive, but as it is only one of a long series of decisions under which the doctrine of authorization by implication has been built up, and in view of the gravity of the parliamentary situation which

would follow if the decision of last Thursday were permitted to stand and should be cited as a precedent in the consideration of future appropriation bills, I ask the indulgence of the Chair to submit corroborating opinions by Chairmen and Speakers passing on similar points of order over a period of many years.

Mr. DOWELL. Mr. Chairman, may I ask that the proviso be read again?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair may say that the point of order is against the language beginning in line 23, page 70, through to line 7, page 71.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, there is a long line of decisions under which it is held that the law creating a governmental agency impliedly authorizes an appropriation for maintenance, including allowances for automobiles and other essential equipment, under which the law authorizing a governmental agency to perform certain duties is held by implication to authorize appropriations for the necessary supplies and implements essential to the proper performance of such duties; under which authorization for an appropriation is held to authorize provision for material ordinarily required in effecting the purpose for which the appropriation is made. Decisions to this effect include, among others, two opinions by Chairman William J. Graham, of Illinois (Cannon's Precedents, secs. 1193, 1195).

A notable decision on this point was handed down by Chairman ROBERT LUCE, of Massachusetts, one of the best-versed Members of the House in parliamentary procedure and the author of books which are landmarks in constitutional and legislative literature, in which he said:

The Chair is of opinion that by an attempt to put into the law minute provision for all possible manner of expenditure the size of the statute books would be largely increased, and that by reason of the impossibility of foresight in matter of detail more harm than good would result. It has been the uniform ruling of preceding Chairmen, so far as the Chair can ascertain, that these minor and incidental objects of expenditures are natural to the conduct of the business establishment concerned. For these reasons the Chair overrules the point of order.

A similar decision was made by Chairman Joseph Walsh, of Massachusetts, in 1921 (Cannon's Precedents, sec. 1237), and in the same year a point of order against a comparable item was overruled by Chairman James R. Mann, of Illinois, one of the most eminent authorities on procedure who ever served in the House. Mr. Mann said:

The Chair thinks that is an incident quite within the power of Congress to appropriate for without specific authorization, the same as for the purchase of pens and ink, or anything else necessary for the conduct of the embassy. The Chair overrules the point of order (Cannon's Precedents, sec. 1253).

By a coincidence, Chairman Simeon D. Fess, of Ohio (sec. 1127), overruled the same point of order in the same session of Congress.

Lest section 78, title V, of the Code, to which reference was made when the point of order was under discussion Thursday, might be cited as limiting or nullifying the general rule laid down in the decisions just cited, I include a decision by Chairman Joseph W. Byrns, the late Speaker, on a point of order raised against an appropriation for the purchase of automobiles in the Indian appropriation bill, January 5, 1915. Section 5 of the Legislative, Executive, and Judicial Appropriation Act for the fiscal year 1915 (the present sec. 78, title 5, U. S. Code) had been cited in support of the point of order. Chairman Byrns held (sec. 1126, Cannon's Precedents):

The Chair has some personal knowledge of the reasons which brought about the action of the Committee on Appropriations in recommending the enactment of such legislation. As has been stated several times, it was intended to correct a possible abuse in applying the lump-sum contingent fund to the purchase of automobiles, and so forth. This section was passed in order to afford Congress some information as to the automobiles that were to be purchased, and why they were to be purchased.

The Chair does not think it was intended by Congress to deny itself the right in an appropriation bill to authorize any executive department of the Government to purchase motor-drawn vehicles or any other kind of vehicles where they are needed as an administrative necessity. The section in question provides that these automobiles and vehicles shall be purchased for the use of superintendents, farmers, physicians, field matrons, allotting, irrigation,

and other employees of the Indian field service in the supervision and administration of the affairs of the Indians.

It is very clear to the Chair that the occasion might arise as an administrative necessity where an automobile, or a motor-drawn vehicle, or some other class of vehicle, like a wagon or other horse-drawn vehicle, would be necessary in order to properly perform the duties of the Bureau of Indian Affairs. The Chair does not think that the section which has been quoted and relied on to sustain this point of order goes so far as to require, or that it was intended to require, special legislation. It seems to the Chair that it was passed for the purpose of providing a check by Congress, so to speak, on the purchase of motor-drawn vehicles used by the various departments of the Government, so that Congress might have before it estimates from these various departments as to the number of vehicles required, and why they were needed.

The point has been made that this section of the Legislative, Executive, and Judicial Act provides that there shall not be expended out of any appropriation, etc., any money for any vehicle for any branch of the Government service unless the same is specifically authorized by law. The Chair thinks that is nothing more or less than limitation upon an administrative officer, and that if Congress in its wisdom sees fit to authorize the purchase of motor-drawn vehicles or other vehicles for the administrative purposes set forth in this bill, then it would be authorized by law within the meaning of the section referred to, because an appropriation bill after it has passed is as much law as any other statute which may be passed.

The Chair therefore overrules the point of order.

In this connection, may I call particular attention to an authoritative decision by one of the ablest and most experienced parliamentarians in the House today, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. DOWELL], confirming the operation of section 78 of title V of the Code as impliedly authorizing appropriations for automobiles. In effect, his decision holds that when a statute provides, as section 78 provides, that no appropriation made in any act shall be available for expenditure for a given purpose unless specific authority is given therefor, it impliedly assumes that the specific authority required will or may be in the language of the appropriation and inferentially authorizes the inclusion of such specific authority in the appropriation bill.

In passing on the question February 14, 1930 (sec. 1201, Cannon's Precedents), Chairman DOWELL ruled:

The point of order is made to this language because there is no authorization for it under the law. The attention of the Chair has been called by the chairman of the subcommittee to title 5, chapter 1, section 83, of the law, which was read and which is as follows:

"No money appropriated by any act shall be expended for membership fees or dues of any officer or employee of the United States or of the District of Columbia in any society or association or for expenses of attendance of any person at any meeting or convention of members of any society or association, unless such fees, dues, or expenses are authorized to be paid by specific appropriations for such purposes, or are provided for in express terms in some general appropriations."

It seems to the Chair that the language used in the appropriation carries out specifically what the law says shall be done if appropriations are made. The Chair overrules the point of order.

In conclusion, permit me to cite a decision by Chairman John N. Garner, of Texas, subsequently Presiding Officer of both the House and the Senate (sec. 1209, Cannon's Precedents), substantiating the doctrine under which authorization of estimates is held to authorize appropriations made pursuant to such estimates.

The concluding sentence of section 78, title V, United States Code, directs the departments, in their annual estimates, to submit detailed estimates of their requirements for automobiles for the ensuing year. The decision by Chairman Garner holds that where the law directs a department to submit estimates for a given purpose it impliedly authorizes an appropriation therefor. I shall not delay the Committee with further details of the decision.

Mr. Chairman, I trust the Chair is disposed to render a decision in conformity with the precedents just cited.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is ready to rule.

Since last Thursday, when the Chair passed upon a somewhat similar proposition, an opportunity has been afforded to look more fully into the precedents governing such cases. The Chair has examined the precedents which may be found in Cannon's Precedents, volume 7, sections 1127, 1193, 1197, 1235, and 1245. The Chair finds that those decisions uniformly hold that an appropriation for the hire or purchase of automobiles is in order on a general appropriation bill. In this connection the Chair desires to call attention to the fact

that on February 8, 1929, a point of order was raised against the provision in the naval appropriation bill appropriating money for the hire of automobiles. In overruling the point of order the Chairman, Mr. LUCE, of Massachusetts, stated:

The Chair is of opinion that by an attempt to put into the law minute provision for all possible manner of expenditure the size of the statute books would be largely increased, and that by reason of the impossibility of foresight in matter of detail more harm than good would result. It has been the uniform ruling of preceding Chairmen, so far as the Chair can ascertain, that these minor and incidental objects of expenditures are natural to the conduct of the business establishment concerned.

The Chair also desires to call attention to the fact that on April 23, 1937, Mr. TABER, of New York, made a point of order against an identical provision in the agriculture appropriation bill authorizing the expenditure of not to exceed \$45,000 for the purchase of automobiles by the Bureau of Public Roads and contended that there was no authorization of law for the purchase of automobiles by that Bureau.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri and Mr. UMSTEAD argued that the provision was purely a limitation on an appropriation and that, without it, the Bureau would have authority to spend the entire appropriation for automobiles if they so desired.

The Chairman, Mr. HANCOCK of North Carolina, in overruling the point of order stated:

The Chair overrules the point of order on the ground that the proviso constitutes a limitation, without which the Secretary could spend any amount within the total of the appropriation for this purpose.

The Chair, in view of the precedents just cited, thinks that the proviso to which the point of order has been directed is in order and overrules the point of order made by the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CANNON of Missouri: On page 70, line 14, strike out "\$63,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$125,000,000."

On page 70, lines 15 and 16, strike out "a part of the sum of \$125,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "the amount."

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I am glad to be able to offer this amendment. There is no subject on which the Members of the committee and the House are in more complete accord than the necessity of maintaining our national highway program, and there are few projects which contribute so effectively to the alleviation of unemployment as road-construction projects. And certainly no relief activity provides such permanent benefits and leaves behind such substantial assets to the community and the Nation at large. For this reason the committee directs me to offer an amendment appropriating the full amount carried in the supplementary estimate submitted by the Budget. The bill as originally reported to the House carried a total appropriation of \$100,000,000 for this purpose. This amount was to provide for all public roads, including the Federal aid primary system, the feeder roads system, elimination of grade crossings, and forest roads and trails, a total of \$100,000,000 in all. At that time, in response to a request from the Secretary of Agriculture, the States were marking time on the submission of projects, and no additional obligations were accruing. Had that situation continued, the \$100,000,000 would have been ample to take care of all requirements under the bill until Congress would again be in session. However, subsequent to the date on which the Budget estimate was submitted, and subsequent to the time the matter was under consideration in the subcommittee, the Secretary of Agriculture notified the States that the inhibition against the submission of projects was no longer in effect and that they were at liberty to submit projects as formerly. Of course, when such additional projects were submitted they became contractual obligations under the law, and it was necessary to make provision for them in the appropriation. For that reason a supplemental estimate was submitted by the Bureau of the Budget in the sum of \$101,500,000.

This specific amount was arrived at after consultation and collaboration with the Committee on Roads. The legislative Committee on Roads had made a long study of the subject and finally reported a bill providing the usual authorization for the years 1940 and 1941, equivalent to the authorization previously given for the years 1938 and 1939.

In this connection the Committee on Appropriations desires to express its appreciation both of the generous consideration and cooperation given it by the Committee on Roads, and especially by the able chairman of that committee, the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. CARTWRIGHT], who collaborated with us in submitting to the Budget the figures which were finally adopted as now incorporated in the estimate, and which conform to the views of the Committee on Roads and its chairman, the gentleman from Oklahoma. This amount will take care of every obligation for 1938 and 1939 and will insure ample support of an unrestricted highway program until Congress is again in session.

Also, by direction of the Committee on Appropriations, in conformity with the estimate submitted to us, and with the approval of the Committee on Roads, I will submit the remaining five of a series of six amendments which provide for the increase of \$101,500,000 in the appropriation to an aggregate of \$201,500,000 for primary roads, feeder roads, grade crossings, forest roads and trails, park and reservation roads, and all purposes for which the Government will incur obligations under the authorization act before the next session of Congress.

The following table indicates the allocation of road funds as supplemented by the appropriation carried in the pending amendment:

Class of roads	Regular Budget	Supplemental estimate	Total
Federal aid:			
Primary system.....	\$63,000,000	\$62,000,000	\$125,000,000
Feeder roads.....	10,000,000	10,000,000	20,000,000
Elimination of grade crossings.....	20,000,000	20,000,000	40,000,000
Public lands highways.....		2,500,000	2,500,000
Forest roads and trails.....	7,000,000	7,000,000	14,000,000
Total.....	100,000,000	101,500,000	201,500,000

The amounts provided under the amended Budget shown above will be sufficient to meet all accruing obligations under both the 1938 and 1939 authorizations until Congress shall have had opportunity at the next regular session to provide additional appropriations. The road program will proceed, under the amended Budget, as expeditiously as though the full amount of the 1939 authorization were appropriated at this time.

The state of the appropriations with respect to the authorization will be as follows:

Class of roads	Annual authorization	Total of Budget estimate	Amount of estimate applicable to	
			1938 authorization	1939 authorization
Federal aid:				
Primary system.....	\$125,000,000	\$125,000,000	\$125,000,000	-----
Feeder roads.....	25,000,000	20,000,000	20,000,000	-----
Elimination of grade crossings.....	50,000,000	40,000,000	40,000,000	-----
Public lands highways.....	2,500,000	2,500,000	-----	\$2,500,000
Forest roads and trails.....	14,000,000	14,000,000	7,000,000	7,000,000

Under the established practice in the expenditure of road funds, sums appropriated under 1938 authorizations are available to pay obligations accruing under 1939 authorizations. The language in the estimate relating to the year's authorization, of which the appropriation is a part, is merely descriptive and does not limit the use of the money to the year's authorization so designated. Many of the States are not abreast of their 1938 allotments, which makes it possible to meet obligations under the 1939 authorization for States which are current in their programs out of sums herein provided against the 1938 authorizations.

The appropriation of the full Budget estimates, regular and supplemental, aggregating a total of \$201,500,000, supplies every need which can be anticipated in the maintenance of the road program as originally projected and as continued in the current authorization.

Mr. MOTT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, whatever may have been the reason for the change of attitude on the part of the Appropriations Committee, I am very glad, indeed, that the committee has changed its mind and that it has finally decided to increase the appropriation for Federal-aid highway construction up to the full amount authorized by the Committee on Roads.

I am also glad that the President and the Budget Director have changed their minds in this regard.

The amounts which were decided upon by the Roads Committee and written into the 1936 road authorization bill, after long and careful and painstaking study and consideration, never should have been reduced in the first place by the Appropriations Committee.

The Roads Committee, in my opinion, performs a work the value of which is not exceeded by that of any other committee of this body. I have always taken a great deal of pride and a great deal of pleasure in being a member of this committee, and so has everyone who serves upon it. We appreciate the confidence which the Congress and the country have always shown in the Roads Committee and the general approval which has been given to its work.

There are 48 States of the Union which depend upon and rely upon the work of the Committee on Roads to enable them to make and to carry out their road-building programs. When this committee reports an authorization bill it assumes a serious responsibility. If the authorization of any committee of this House ought to be taken as a mandate by the Committee on Appropriations, it is an authorization from the Roads Committee. The Committee on Roads is charged with the duty of evolving the road policy of the United States and of determining the amounts needed to carry out that policy. When it has done this and has submitted its findings to the House in the shape of an authorization bill, and when the House has passed that bill, then, it seems to me that that action on the part of the House is a mandate to the Appropriations Committee to appropriate the amount authorized.

I am glad that these amendments, which will be offered in a series, have now been agreed to and that there is to be no further controversy about them from the Appropriations Committee, because they will restore all of the road funds authorized by the Roads Committee in its last road bill to be appropriated in the present Congress.

These amendments will put the road-building program of the United States and of the several States back in the position where it was under the 1936 bill. That position never should have been disturbed. To refuse to adopt these amendments now would be to demoralize the road programs of every State in the United States.

Mr. DOWELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOTT. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. DOWELL. And is it not true that the Committee on Roads calls before it the engineers from all over the United States engaged in road building and that the committee has made such an investigation that it is familiar with road building in all the States of the Union?

Mr. MOTT. That is correct; and I believe everyone in Congress understands that and appreciates it. No legislation has the benefit of more expert advice and opinions and none is more thoroughly worked out and considered than that which is reported during each Congress from the Roads Committee. Every highway department of every State plans its program in accordance with this legislation. Those plans are always 2-year plans. State road-building plans are always made on the basis of the amounts of Federal funds authorized by the Roads Committee bills, and they are made with the full confidence and expectation that the amounts authorized will be appropriated.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. MOTT. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Is it the purpose or the intention, if this amendment is adopted and this \$100,000,000 restored, it will not be necessary to come forward with another \$100,000,000 for what I see referred to in the papers as a part of the relief program?

Mr. MOTT. No; this is not a part of the relief program. This is the Federal road-building program; the regular program carrying out the accepted policy of furnishing Federal funds in aid to States for road building; but, incidentally, I may say to the distinguished gentleman from Ohio, it is one of the greatest and most beneficial relief programs we could possibly have. The money that is spent in the building of roads furnishes jobs to hundreds of thousands of men who would not otherwise have them, and at the same time it gives to the taxpayer value received for the money he spends.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. I am very much in favor of it, but I want to know whether the gentleman understands it is the intention of the administration or some other influence to come forward with another road program or another \$100,000,000 for road purposes?

Mr. MOTT. I cannot speak for the administration, but the appropriations in this bill are the only ones that have been authorized by the Roads Committee for this year. However, we do intend at this session to bring in another road authorization bill for the next 2 years, so that the States may have something on which to base their plans for 1940 and 1941, and we hope it may receive a rule from the Rules Committee and that it may be considered here and enacted before the adjournment of the Congress. [Applause.]

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOTT. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Answering the inferential question of my friend from Oregon, may I say in deference to the subcommittee, we were guided in large measure, at least, by the indications from the Budget Bureau, seeking also to cooperate with the President of the United States in approximating a balanced Budget at some time. So the action of this subcommittee was taken pursuant to the recommendation that came from the Budget Bureau to the committee.

Mr. MOTT. In reply to that, may I say that the Budget recommendations should have been in accordance with the authorizations of the Committee on Roads in the first place, and then the gentleman's committee would not have been put in the position of changing its mind every time the Budget Director got a new idea. If you were going to begin now to balance the Budget, after 6 or 8 years of continuous unbalancing, I think your committee began at the very poorest place it could possibly select.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOTT. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. RICH. Does the gentleman think it is possible for this administration ever to balance the Budget?

Mr. MOTT. Oh, yes; it would be possible, I think.

Mr. RICH. What gives the gentleman any idea that a thing like that could happen?

Mr. MOTT. I am an optimist. [Laughter and applause.] [Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Chairman, this is one time it is very evident that the recommendation of the President is going to be agreed to by practically every Member of the House, Democrats, Republicans, and Progressives, including those who are continually demanding to know "where we are going to get the money." I do not hesitate to say that if conditions in this country had not changed last fall, I would have stood squarely behind the President in his efforts to reduce the regular annual appropriations for Federal aid for roads.

We started off in 1917 when Mr. Shackelford, of Missouri, the first chairman of the Committee on Roads, sponsored a bill for \$75,000,000 for Federal aid to roads, over a period of 5 years, \$5,000,000 the first year, \$10,000,000 the

second year, \$15,000,000 the third year, \$20,000,000 the fourth year, and \$25,000,000 the fifth year. What for? To stimulate States in the construction of hard-surface roads.

Congress has stimulated the States since that time until they are now thoroughly intoxicated. Well over \$4,000,000,000 of the public's money has been allocated for Federal aid for roads. When the depression came along Congress increased the amount of its yearly contribution from year to year. This is legislation that Congressmen like to vote for. The highway departments are well organized in every State. The contractors are also well organized, and, while many demand a reduction in the normal expenditures of the Government, when it comes to something they have an interest in they forget their desire for a balanced Budget and urge liberal appropriations. Members of Congress who stand for economy likewise forget economy when such popular appropriations are under consideration. Today, of course, you say the President asked for it in his message read at the desk a few days ago and you support the President. It remains to be seen how many will go along with the President on the other recommendations he made.

There is no doubt about the road program being valuable. It is probably the soundest investment we make from the standpoint of benefit to the public. Every State in the Union has a gasoline tax, which should be applied to the construction and maintenance of roads. Let me ask the Chairman, not only of the subcommittee but also of the Committee on Roads as to whether or not anything has developed to disclose how many States of the Union today are diverting the money collected from gasoline taxes to purposes other than the construction and maintenance of roads?

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. A few States have diverted funds, but we are trying to perfect legislation that will stop the diversion of gasoline-tax funds to other purposes than roads. Congress should set the example itself, however.

Mr. COCHRAN. I come from the city, not from the country, but I am in favor of earmarking the appropriations for roads so that not less than 35 percent shall be used for farm-to-market roads. We promise the farmers we are going to build farm-to-market roads, but in the main the money has been used for primary roads. It so happens that I was partly responsible during the vacation period of this Congress in getting the Bureau of Public Roads and the President to issue an order that 25 percent of the appropriation of 1 year be devoted solely to farm-to-market roads.

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. That was under the emergency appropriation, and a bill which will be considered later in this session provides that \$25,000,000 each of the years 1940 to 1941 shall be applied to farm-to-market roads. Nineteen hundred and thirty-six was the first time that was put in the regular Federal-aid roads bill.

Mr. COCHRAN. As I said, this is one of these popular appropriations that every one votes for, but I insist that the Congress should provide in language that cannot be misunderstood that when the States of this Union divert the money they collect from automobile taxes and gasoline taxes to purposes other than the construction and maintenance of roads, we shall not allocate any money to that particular State until that practice has been discontinued.

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. I agree with the gentleman on that, and we are trying to do that.

Mr. COCHRAN. I hope the gentleman's committee will bring in legislation that will so provide.

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. We have it in mind now.

Mr. MOTT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COCHRAN. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired.

Mr. MOTT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the time of the gentleman from Missouri be extended for an additional minute.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MOTT. Mr. Chairman, I agree entirely with what the gentleman had to say about diversion. Most decidedly, diversion of gasoline taxes for purposes other than road

building is wrong. Very few States, however, I may say to the gentleman, are guilty of diversion. My own certainly is not. But may I ask the gentleman if he knows that the Federal Government is the greatest diverter of gasoline-tax funds that there is in the United States?

Mr. COCHRAN. Oh, no. The United States Government is not. I looked that up. The United States Government collects about \$200,000,000 in gasoline taxes and is allocating many times that amount for Federal aid for roads.

Mr. MOTT. The figures show that the Federal Government is collecting more in gasoline and other automobile taxes than it is appropriating for roads.

Mr. COCHRAN. Oh, no. Furthermore, the gasoline tax was not put on the tax bill solely for the purpose of being used for the construction of roads in this country.

Mr. MOTT. I know that, and therefore I say it is a diversion.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has again expired.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask for 1 additional minute.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. COCHRAN. In 1937, according to the figures submitted to the Committee on Ways and Means, \$178,000,000 was collected.

Mr. MOTT. That is for gasoline alone. The gentleman is not including oil, tires, or any other of the excise taxes levied against automobiles and accessories, which would bring the figure to an annual amount considerably in excess of our road appropriation. The figures are given in detail in Road Committee hearings and report for this year.

Mr. COCHRAN. Does the gentleman feel that the tobacco tax should be applied to tobacco only?

Mr. MOTT. I am not talking about tobacco. I am merely stating to the gentleman that the Federal Government collects more in excise taxes from gasoline, oil, automobiles, and the things allied to automobiles than it pays out in road appropriations.

Mr. COCHRAN. And I am telling the gentleman that the record will show that his statement is not correct. I am going to get the record and place it in my remarks later in the day. When you see the tremendous amount we have allocated you will then be forced to admit at least a billion more has been used for road construction than has been collected.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has again expired.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words. I take this time in the belief that a good many Members here are like myself—they do not know all the facts about what is going on here. I ask the attention of the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. CARTWRIGHT] and ask him what it is proposed to do with reference to the regular road program?

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. All of these amendments which are being presented by the chairman of the subcommittee merely take care of all obligations until Congress will have an opportunity to meet again.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Does that mean that the gentleman's road program will not come up for consideration at this session of Congress?

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. No; it does not. This is a proposition that the Committee on Roads should have been kept out of; but because of confusion, because of certain recommendations that had been made, we were forced into it.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. If we adopt this amendment, which I hope we will as far as that is concerned, being in favor of roads as I am, does that mean that State road authorities of the country will have the usual appropriation with which they have been operating?

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. That is exactly correct.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. And does it mean if we do not adopt this amendment that they will not have the usual appropriation?

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. They will not; the gentleman is correct.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Just one more question concerning a matter that the gentleman and I and others have been very actively interested in for several years—how much will go to secondary roads?

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. It means \$10,000,000 more for farm-to-market, rural free delivery, school-bus roads.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Is that sufficient?

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. That is sufficient to carry out the obligations.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. And I understand that the gentleman, as chairman of the Committee on Roads, is here favoring this, and that it will be a well-rounded-out program for the furtherance of our program to get aid for farm-to-market roads. The gentleman and I made the first big fight for this program.

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. The gentleman is correct. The Committee on Roads is here on this. I am merely the chairman.

Mr. MOTT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. I yield.

Mr. MOTT. Apropos the colloquy between the gentleman from Missouri and myself a few moments ago, I have the figures which I would like to put in the Record. This is taken from the report of the chairman of our committee on the pending road bill. The total authorizations per year for the next 2 years are \$283,000,000. The collections in taxes from gasoline, lubricating oil, oils, tires and inner tubes, automobiles and motorcycles, automobile trucks, auto parts and accessories, amount to \$359,948,439 per year.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Yes; I yield to permit the gentleman from Missouri to reply to the gentleman from Oregon.

Mr. COCHRAN. Certainly the gentleman does not think for one moment that when the revenue bill was passed carrying the taxes on gasoline and various excise taxes on automobiles and accessories that these taxes were adopted with the understanding that this specific money would be used for roads only. Furthermore, this report shows only the regular appropriations for Federal-aid highways. I ask the gentleman to find out how much W. P. A. spent, and find out how much extra money Congress appropriated for roads.

Mr. MOTT. I was not raising that point. The point I was raising was that the Federal Government was a greater gasoline-tax diverter than any State government.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. DOWELL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

I want to emphasize for just a moment the statement of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COCHRAN] with reference to the diversion of gasoline taxes and automobile taxes from the construction of Federal-aid roads. The Committee on Roads has insisted that the Federal-aid appropriations should be matched by the States and that the gasoline tax and automobile tax should be used for that purpose and not diverted to other uses.

There are at present nearly 30,000,000 motor vehicles on the streets and highways in the United States, and it is necessary that the road building be continued if we are to keep up with the great increase of the automobile traffic.

We have found that some of the States have diverted the gasoline money to other purposes than matching the Government Federal-aid fund. When a State diverts the gasoline and automobile taxes to other purposes and fails to match Federal-aid road funds, and the roads are not constructed, it is curbing and interfering with the Federal-aid system. It is intended that the Federal-aid funds shall be used in the construction of roads throughout the Federal-aid system, and it is intended that the several States will match these funds and construct the roads in the several States out of gasoline and automobile taxes.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOWELL. I yield.

Mr. MICHENER. If I understand the gentleman correctly, his theory is that the Congress of the United States should go into a State and tell the State which taxes it may raise and what it may do with the money after it levies the tax.

Mr. DOWELL. No. My position is that the tax raised for road construction by the States under its Federal-aid system should be from the gasoline and automobile tax.

Mr. MICHENER. Let us assume a State decided to raise its road money otherwise, or decides to levy a 7-cent tax on gasoline.

Mr. DOWELL. That is all right.

Mr. MICHENER. And it provides that 5 cents go to roads and 2 cents to something else. Does the gentleman insist that the Federal Government has any right to tell a State what it shall do with the taxes it levies and raises for State internal purposes?

Mr. DOWELL. If the gentleman understood me that way, it is not correct. At least, I did not so intend it. I did intend to say that the matching of Federal-aid funds should be paid out of gasoline and automobile taxes.

The testimony before the Committee on Roads shows that from 85 to 90 percent of the Federal-aid funds go to labor, and I doubt if there is any other construction work done by the Government where so much of the appropriations goes to labor. These highways are badly needed, including the farm-to-market and rural route roads, and the men out of employment are in great need of the employment.

WEATHER BUREAU IMPORTANT TO BUSINESS, AGRICULTURE, AND AVIATION

Mr. MAVERICK. Mr. Chairman, I am going to speak on a subject which is not specifically in order so far as roads are concerned, but it does have to do with this bill, and, in my opinion, it is a matter of extreme importance.

There was approved by the Bureau of the Budget the sum of \$541,951 for the development of aerological service in the Weather Bureau. The Weather Bureau does essential and most important work for agriculture and business in general, and for civil and military aviation.

I want to explain why I think this extra appropriation ought to be approved. We are going to approve, and everybody knows we are going to approve, the sum of \$100,000,000 in addition to the provisions of this bill for roads. This weather item of \$500,000 amounts to about one two-hundredths of the \$100,000,000, yet, apparently, we are not going to approve it at the present time. I am making this talk so the record will show the importance of Weather Bureau work and that aviation needs this extra appropriation.

THE ESTABLISHMENT OF 33 STATIONS AT AIRWAY TERMINALS

The purpose of this additional Weather Bureau service is to establish 33 stations at airway terminals in the United States of America. They will give a civilian and military service and, as I stated, the item was approved by the Department of Agriculture and was requested by both the Department of Agriculture and the Bureau of Air Commerce. The Budget urged its adoption. It was not objected to so far as the War Department is concerned and, in fact, I talked to them and they were hoping it would be agreed to.

As I said it establishes 33 air stations. The Federal airways in the last several years have greatly increased and from every standpoint of commerce and business are just as important as roads or, at least, proportionately important. It is essential for air travel that this item be included and if the House does not do so I hope the Senate does approve it.

PROVIDE SERVICE; PUT IN PROPER DEPARTMENT

The item is for the purpose of giving details on heights, visibility, upper-air soundings, maps, and information of that kind. If a member of the committee would like to say a few words I certainly would like to hear him because I believe if this item is not approved now it ought to be as soon as we can get around to it.

I heard one of the members of the committee say that this ought not to be under the Department of Agriculture. If it does not belong there, let us put it in the Bureau of Air

Commerce or in the War Department, wherever it properly belongs.

I heard others say that this would benefit the big airplane companies. Well, when you ride in an airplane and get killed, it does not make very much difference whether you are in a big plane or a little plane, or whether the plane is owned by a big company or a little company. This is for the benefit of human life, the defense, and the commerce of the country, and the item ought to be included.

I repeat, we are spending \$200,000,000 and we are all agreeing to it, yet we are passing up an item one two-hundredths as large, which is extremely important to the people of the United States, both from the viewpoint of life and business. [Applause.]

In order that the RECORD may show the recommendations of the Department of Agriculture, I insert them from the hearings, and they are as follows:

AEROLOGY

Mr. CANNON. The next item is aerology, as follows:

"Aerology: For the maintenance of stations for observing, measuring, and investigating atmospheric phenomena, including salaries and other expenses, in the city of Washington and elsewhere, \$2,732,130, of which \$55,000 shall be immediately available."

JUSTIFICATION OF ESTIMATE

Dr. GREGG. The following statement is presented for the record in explanation of this item:

Appropriation act, 1938.....	\$2,190,179
Budget estimate, 1939.....	2,732,130
Increase.....	541,951

"The net increase of \$541,951 in this item for 1939 consists of:

"(1) An increase of \$544,951 for commercial airway meteorological service, as follows:

"(a) \$449,951 for establishment of Weather Bureau airport stations at 33 airway terminals; and for inaugurating hourly weather reporting service at 9 points on airways: The Secretary of Commerce has requested the establishment of Weather Bureau airport stations at 40 important airway terminals which do not now have Weather Bureau service, in order that weather maps, hourly weather reports, upper-air wind data, and meteorological advice may be available at those points and along radiating airways for the safety of air navigation and for the particular requirements of the Bureau of Air Commerce airway traffic control program. With the above amount, the Weather Bureau would establish a minimum of 33 stations at airway terminals, manned by full-time Weather Bureau personnel, and a minimum of 9 stations for hourly weather reporting service on airways manned by part-time observers under the supervision of a full-time Weather Bureau employee.

"(b) \$20,000 for establishment of new stations and extension of airway weather service in Alaska: The Secretary of Commerce has also recommended that the Weather Bureau obtain funds for the extension and strengthening of the airway meteorological service in Alaska, to keep pace with and for the protection of the rapidly expanding air transport and aviation activities. Due to the deficiency of surface transportation, aviation is a major factor in the development of the Territory, and the airway meteorological service should be expanded and intensified to meet this situation. The \$20,000 increase will permit the establishment of first-order Weather Bureau stations at Anchorage and Ruby, with facilities for taking upper-air wind observations; the assignment of one additional employee to each of the existing first-order stations at Juneau, Fairbanks, and Nome, thus permitting additional observations and service at those points; and some slight intensification of service at and in the vicinity of other important points.

"(c) Seventy-five thousand dollars for the procurement, installation, and maintenance of modern instruments for airway stations now having incomplete or outmoded equipment: The Secretary of Commerce has recommended that the Weather Bureau request funds for replacing outmoded instruments and completing the instrumental equipment at airway stations now deficient in this respect. At present many of the airway weather reporting stations are incompletely equipped with instruments, and at many places the present equipment is partially or almost completely out of date. This results in incomplete and inaccurate reports being received from such points, omissions, and inaccuracies usually showing up in the most vital data, such as ceilings, dew points, winds, etc., which must, as a safety factor, be measured carefully by the most improved equipment possible to obtain. Because pilots and others using the airways, as well as the meteorologists of the Weather Bureau, are forced to use observations based on questionable or inadequate data, the efficiency of the service as a whole is greatly weakened.

"(2) A reduction of \$3,000 made possible through the contemplated completion during the fiscal year 1938 of a type of radiometerograph by the Bureau of Standards, funds for which were provided during the fiscal years 1937 and 1938.

"WORK UNDER THIS APPROPRIATION"

"General: As a consequence of the provisions of the Air Commerce Act of 1926, meteorological information and flying-weather forecasts are furnished to pilots on all airways designated by the Secretary of Commerce as routes suitable for air commerce. In addition, investigation and study and general weather forecasting of the upper air in the interest of air navigation are conducted under this appropriation.

"A. AEROLOGICAL SERVICE"

"1. Commercial airway meteorological service: Intensive weather service for air navigation was inaugurated by the Weather Bureau soon after passage of the Air Commerce Act in May 1926. At the close of 1926 the transcontinental airway was the only one on which flights were being made both day and night. Since that time the airway weather service has expanded with increased number of Federal airways. In 1937 there was approximately 20,000 miles of airways over which 24-hour weather service was maintained and approximately 15,000 miles over which service was maintained on a less than 24-hour basis. The airway weather service is maintained to provide the maximum amount of safety possible in air navigation so far as weather is concerned.

"Specific and accurate weather information is essential in air travel, particularly as regards ceiling heights and visibility. The airway weather service consists primarily of hourly reports from stations on the airways and 6-hour reports from off-airway stations, the latter category being composed of about 160 stations, thus providing a dense network of reports over the country as a whole. These reports are collected at 11 designated centers where they are charted and aviation forecasts prepared. These forecasts are promptly distributed over the airways network, chiefly by means of teletype and radio, with special advices at 3-hour intervals whenever important weather changes justify.

"2. Upper-air soundings: Observations in the upper air were begun in 1898 by the use of kites and captive balloons. Airplane observations began to displace kites and captive balloons in 1931 and wholly supplanted them in 1933.

"In July 1934 the Weather Bureau operated six airplane observation stations by contracting with commercial flyers, and the War and Navy Departments made airplane observations at approximately an equal number of stations each. Beginning in the first half of the fiscal year 1938, the Weather Bureau will have under contract 13 airplane observation stations, including 1 at Fairbanks, Alaska. The War and Navy Departments will make observations at eight and nine stations, respectively, including the Navy Department's stations at Pearl Harbor, Hawaii; Coco Solo, Canal Zone; and St. Thomas, Virgin Islands. The Dominion of Canada will make airplane observations at Toronto, Canada; and the Government of Newfoundland will make such observations at Norris Arm, Newfoundland. All of these observations will be available for use at forecast centers and other points in the United States.

"Pilot-balloon observations were inaugurated by the Weather Bureau in 1918, with the number of stations gradually increasing to some 77 in 1937. Airplane and pilot-balloon observations are essential in both general and airway forecasting and in identifying air masses.

"Sounding-balloon observations provide the same data as both airplane and pilot-balloon observations but to much greater heights. The records, however, are not available for current use, as the meteorograph usually lands at a considerable distance from the stations.

"Radiometerograph sounding-balloon observations will be made in 1937 at Burbank, Calif.; Fairbanks, Alaska; Washington, Mass.; and Washington, D. C. Airplane observations are made daily to heights of 16,500 feet, and free-air temperatures, pressures, and humidities are obtained. Pilot-balloon observations are made four times daily, and free-air wind directions and velocities at various elevations are obtained. These data are furnished to local flying interests and promptly transmitted to the various forecast centers. The computed records are forwarded to the central office of the Weather Bureau at Washington, where they are summarized and used in special studies and investigations. Monthly free-air temperatures and relative humidities for each station and monthly free-air wind resultants for a selected number of key stations are published regularly in the Monthly Weather Review. Sounding-balloon observations are made at only one or a relatively few stations in connection with special investigations of particular weather conditions and during international programs.

"B. AEROLOGICAL INVESTIGATIONS"

"3. Commercial airway forecast investigations: With the accumulation of observational data obtained since the inauguration of intensive airway weather service subsequent to the passage of the Air Commerce Act of 1926, studies have been made with a particular view to determining average flying weather conditions along the airways. Such studies are valuable in laying out new airports and airways and for determining regular flight schedules. Investigations under this project are conducted at the central office at Washington, D. C., and at stations where qualified personnel and the necessary data are available.

"4. Upper-air surveys and investigations: Numerous aerological surveys have been made to determine average temperatures, pressures, humidities, densities, winds, etc., at various elevations for different sections of the country, as well as special studies and investigations of upper-air conditions. Upper-air observations are

classified and correlated with surface conditions in order to determine significant relationships which may be useful in forecasting or to aid in a better understanding of the mechanics of the atmosphere. All observational data are forwarded to the central office of the Weather Bureau in Washington, where they are summarized and classified. The data are then used for making special studies and investigations leading to the improvement of general and airway forecasting, both as regards accuracy and length of time covered; to determine meteorological conditions favorable for the formation of ice on aircraft; and to effect improvements in methods of pressure reductions to sea level and to the 5,000-foot plane; and to increase our knowledge of the mechanics of the atmosphere."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON].

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

FEDERAL-AID SECONDARY OR FEEDER ROADS

For secondary or feeder roads, including farm-to-market roads, rural free delivery mail roads, and public-school bus routes, \$10,000,000, to be immediately available and to remain available until expended, which sum is part of the \$25,000,000 authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year 1938 by section 7 of the act approved June 16, 1936 (49 Stat. 1521).

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CANNON of Missouri: On page 72, line 12, strike out "\$10,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$20,000,000."

On page 72, line 13, strike out "part" and insert in lieu thereof "the remainder."

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, this amendment doubles the amount provided for secondary roads. In response to the suggestion by my good friend, the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. MOTT], to the effect that the Committee on Appropriations had changed its mind, may I say that the Committee on Appropriations has experienced no change either of heart or mind in its purpose to make ample provision for national highways. We originally provided a total of \$100,000,000 because at that time \$100,000,000 was all that was needed to meet conditions as we found them. It was only when those conditions changed and the submission of new projects by the States which made it necessary to enlarge the appropriation that we amended the bill. It was not a change of attitude on the part of the committee but a change of circumstances and an increase in the obligations for which the appropriation was made.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the committee amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I ask the attention of the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. MOTT]. With further reference to the use of Federal funds by the Federal Government, I hold in my hand hearings before the Committee on Appropriations. Mr. Hopkins is testifying, and in speaking of the 1935 emergency relief appropriation, he says that nearly \$500,000,000 of that money was allocated for highway work under the supervision of the Bureau of Public Roads, for the construction of highways, streets, and grade crossings. I also find the W. P. A. had used its money to construct roads and streets in connection with its general work, spending nearly \$2,000,000,000 for the purpose. I am advised the Civilian Conservation Corps has likewise used a tremendous sum of money in constructing roads not only in national parks but in all the forest reservations of the United States. Therefore, when the record is consulted the gentleman from Oregon will find that even though the revenue bill did not provide specifically that the revenues from the gasoline tax, and so forth, were to be used solely for road purposes, nevertheless, the Government has taken out of the Treasury and spent over a billion dollars in excess of that which has been collected under the Revenue Act.

Mr. MOTT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COCHRAN. I yield to the gentleman from Oregon.

Mr. MOTT. Nothing the gentleman has just stated contradicts anything I said in my statement of a few moments ago. We all know that in the early depression years and in the years of emergency W. P. A. money, C. C. C. money, work-relief and direct-relief money was used for certain kinds of road work under certain well-known conditions. We are all glad that these relief agencies used some of their money for road work because there is no place you can put money, relief or otherwise, that will give as great a return in relief as in road work. The expenditure the gentleman refers to, however, was for relief. The road work was incidental. That situation is fully covered in the 1938 Road Committee hearings by the testimony of the representatives of those relief agencies themselves.

Mr. COCHRAN. I did not yield for a speech. In agreeing with what the gentleman states, let me say the gentleman did not bring out in his statement or in his questions any information with reference to the vast amount of money that has been spent for road purposes other than the direct appropriations we make. My purpose in rising was to show the gentleman by the record that we have spent an enormous sum of money in excess of that which we appropriated directly for road purposes. The gentleman claimed a few moments ago the Government was diverting money collected in taxes.

Mr. MOTT. If that is all the gentleman is trying to tell me, he is telling me nothing I do not already know. I am quite familiar with the relief work these agencies did.

Mr. COCHRAN. The gentleman did not place the facts in the RECORD. I wanted to place them in the RECORD so the RECORD would show what has happened.

Mr. MOTT. If the gentleman means that some of the relief work was done on roads, I am glad that happened; but my statement still stands; that annually, year after year, for this year as well as for next year and for the past year, the Government has collected and will continue to collect more in taxes from gasoline, oil, automobiles, and accessories than it has expended or will expend on roads.

Mr. COCHRAN. I may say to the gentleman that in the end he will find his statement will not be correct, because we will use for road purposes a tremendous amount of the money we will appropriate in the relief bill this year as we did in the past and I propose to prove this statement before I complete my remarks.

Mr. MOTT. I hope after a while the Government will adopt a policy of paying out for road building at least as much as it collects in gasoline and other automobile taxes.

Mr. COCHRAN. When will the gentleman be willing to vote for a policy that will stop Federal aid for roads?

Mr. MOTT. When will I vote to stop it?

Mr. COCHRAN. The gentleman will never vote for it.

Mr. MOTT. I certainly will never vote to stop the Federal-aid highway policy because it is a sound policy and I very much doubt whether the gentleman will ever vote to repeal it. May I ask whether the gentleman is going to vote now for these amendments to increase the road appropriations for this year?

Mr. COCHRAN. Yes; because the President this week recommended that the money be appropriated; but I will again say if the President had not made the request I would have stood by his original recommendation for a reduction. Is that plain enough? Where does the money come from that we allocate to the States?

Mr. MOTT. It comes from Federal taxes, of course.

Mr. COCHRAN. It comes out of the pockets of the States. All we do is hand back to them that which we collect. Why not let a State collect the money itself and spend its own money, without having Uncle Sam be the papa all the time?

Mr. MOTT. If the gentleman keeps on talking he will convince me he is against this bill, and he has just said that he is not.

Mr. MICHENER. I wonder if the gentleman means what he says. My State, for instance, gets back about \$2 or \$3 for every \$9 it pays in.

Mr. COCHRAN. So does mine. Missouri is like Michigan, what is called a taxpaying State, one that pays into the Treasury in normal times more than it gets back in Federal aid.

Mr. MICHENER. We are very glad to accept the gentleman's philosophy, if that is the philosophy of the administration. In other words, we will collect our own money and spend our own money.

Mr. COCHRAN. I am not speaking for the administration.

Mr. MICHENER. What will become of the States that have no money?

Mr. COCHRAN. I have in mind to let the States take care of themselves for a while.

Mr. MICHENER. I agree with the gentleman.

Mr. COCHRAN. My viewpoint is if the Federal Government would discontinue the gasoline tax, provided it discontinued Federal aid for roads, and say to the various States if you want more money for roads add the tax the Government was collecting to your State tax and use it specifically for roads. If that was done I think my State would get more in the additional tax than it is now receiving from the Federal Government under the regular allocation for Federal highways. If the States desired to divert the money collected then that would be the business of the individual States and not the Federal Government.

Now as to the expenditures of Federal funds for road purposes. Let us take the report of the Works Progress Administration published last December. On page 10 of that report you find a table which shows for highways, roads, and streets a total of \$2,374,573,434 was spent by the W. P. A. and other Government agencies from 1935 until September 1937. Of this amount \$1,716,575,184 was spent on W. P. A. projects and \$657,998,250 by other Government agencies including the Bureau of Public Roads. Of the \$1,716,575,184 disbursed by W. P. A. the sponsors, the States, and subdivisions contributed between 20 and 25 percent, the balance coming out of the Federal Treasury. Does this look like the Government collected more for gasoline and automobile taxes than it disbursed? The statement that the Government used less than was collected for road purposes is certainly not justified by this record. We are more than 15 years ahead of our regular appropriation for roads due to the depression. Of course, it is a lasting improvement and money well spent when money must be spent to help the unemployed.

I include the following brief excerpts from the report of the Works Progress Administration:

About three-quarters of the estimated total cost of all W. P. A. projects initiated by the end of June 1937 is for construction activities. Repair, improvement, and modernization work account for a little more, and new construction work for a little less, than half the total cost of construction projects. Road construction and improvement are predominant and include large amounts of farm-to-market and other secondary road development as well as important street work in many cities.

Complete summarization of the accomplishments of the works program is virtually impossible because of the wide variety of the work and the varying local circumstances under which it is carried out.

If an inspection were made, agency by agency, it would reveal that more than 10,000 miles of roads have been laid and hundreds of grade crossings have been eliminated through projects of the Bureau of Public Roads.

During about 1 year of W. P. A. and N. Y. A. work project operations, through September 15, 1936, the work already accomplished was both extensive and diversified. At that time more than 29,000 miles of new road had been laid and about 93,500 miles had been repaired or improved.

It is reasonable to assume that the same amount of work on roads was accomplished from September 15, 1936, to September 15, 1937.

Remember the activities of the Works Progress Administration is from relief money and not from the regular appropriations.

The record certainly bears out my statement that we are more than 15 years ahead of our regular road program due to the depression.

The Clerk read as follows:

ELIMINATION OF GRADE CROSSINGS

For the elimination of hazards to life at railroad grade crossings, including the separation or protection of grades at crossings, the

LXXXIII—350

reconstruction of existing railroad grade-crossing structures, and the relocation of highways to eliminate grade crossings, \$20,000,000, to be immediately available and to remain available until expended, which sum is part of the \$50,000,000 authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year 1938 by section 8 of the act approved June 16, 1936 (49 Stat. 1521).

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CANNON of Missouri: On page 72, line 22, strike out "\$20,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$40,000,000."

On page 72, line 24, strike out "part" and insert in lieu thereof "the remainder."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I offer a further amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CANNON of Missouri: On page 73, after line 2, add a new paragraph, as follows:

"PUBLIC-LANDS HIGHWAYS

"For the survey, construction, reconstruction, and maintenance of main roads through unappropriated or unreserved public lands, nontaxable Indian lands, or other Federal reservations other than the forest reservations, under the provisions of the act of June 24, 1930 (23 U. S. C. 3), \$2,500,000, to be immediately available and to remain available until expended, which sum is the amount authorized for the fiscal year 1939 by section 3 of the act approved June 16, 1936 (49 Stat., p. 1520)."

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that this is not authorized by law. As I understand, there is no statute authorizing this particular appropriation.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, in response to the point of order I call the attention of the Chair to the fact that this is authorized in the act of 1936 and this is the exact amount and the exact language of the authorization. Section 3 of the act authorizes it, and I have the act before me.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair overrules the point of order.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Total, Bureau of Public Roads, \$93,000,000.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment correcting the total.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CANNON of Missouri: On page 73, line 3, strike out "\$93,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$187,500,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, there remains one paragraph on page 97 providing for forest roads and trails which was passed over by direction of the Committee.

The Clerk read as follows:

FOREST ROADS AND TRAILS

For carrying out the provisions of section 23 of the Federal Highway Act approved November 9, 1921 (23 U. S. C. 23), including not to exceed \$59,500 for departmental personal services in the District of Columbia, \$7,000,000, which sum is the balance of the amount authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year 1938 by the act approved June 16, 1936, to be immediately available and to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That this appropriation shall be available for the rental, purchase, or construction of buildings necessary for the storage of equipment and supplies used for road and trail construction and maintenance, but the total cost of any such building purchased or constructed under this authorization shall not exceed \$7,500: *Provided further*, That there shall be available from this appropriation not to exceed \$50,000 for the completion of construction of buildings at Denver, Colo., for the storage and repair of Government equipment for use in the construction and maintenance of roads.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CANNON of Missouri: On page 98, line 3, strike out "\$7,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$14,000,000."

On page 98, line 3, strike out "is" and insert in lieu thereof "consists of."

On page 98, line 4, after "1938" insert "and \$7,000,000 of the amount authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year 1939."

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that this is not authorized by law and call the Chair's attention to the language on page 98, "which sum is the balance of the amount authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year 1938," and so forth. It is evident that the authorization is exhausted by previous appropriations.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, this is authorized by the law quoted to the gentleman from New York in response to his point of order raised a few minutes ago. Under the Federal Aid Highway Act, approved June 11, 1916, section 2, there is specific authorization for this purpose. The provision is not subject to a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair feels that the appropriation is duly authorized and therefore overrules the point of order.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Your Honor, I close for the defense. Quite a number of the jury, I am afraid, have already expressed an opinion, but I would like to submit final argument in behalf of my client, the Treasury of the United States, before we take a final vote on the amendments to this bill.

Mr. Chairman, the committees of the House are directed to investigate and report to the House such information as they are able to secure on the legislation which they report for the consideration of the House, and in this spirit the Committee on Appropriations submits such information as we have at this time pertinent to the question at hand.

I may say, Mr. Chairman, the committee is not chargeable with prejudice. Every member of the subcommittee represents an agricultural district. Every member of the subcommittee represents a district which would participate in the increases added to the pending bill in the Committee of the Whole. We could go back to our districts, after voting for these amendments, and get a few more votes, perhaps, because we supported them and be received more cordially at our State capitols if we supported the amendments that have been added to the bill by the Committee of the Whole.

But, Mr. Chairman, this bill is already top-heavy. It is already the largest bill for this purpose ever submitted to the House by the Committee on Appropriations in the history of the American Congress. With the additions which have been made in the Committee of the Whole it now appropriates between \$900,000,000 and \$1,000,000,000. I am certain Members of the House remember very well the protest that went up from the country when it was reported in the headlines of the Nation's newspapers that Congress had adjourned after voting \$1,000,000,000 for all governmental purposes. And Speaker Reed retorted that this was a billion-dollar country. Everywhere the Congress was decried, and criticized as "a billion-dollar Congress," yet we are here appropriating between \$900,000,000 and a billion dollars in this one bill.

Furthermore, the addition of the amounts added to the bill by these amendments throw the bill far over the Budget estimates. Here is \$3,800,000 for Bang's disease, \$1,000,000 for wildlife, \$400,000 for cattle ticks, \$10,000,000 for farm tenancy, a total of \$15,200,000 tacked onto the bill after 30 or 40 minutes' consideration.

It is a remarkable coincidence that all these amendments are to spend money. Not an amendment proposes to save money; not a proposition is offered to reduce a bill carrying thousands of items and millions of dollars. Nobody is interested in economy but the committee; everybody wants to spend—and that after the committee has already spent so much it is ashamed to spend any more.

Mr. SCHNEIDER of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to my friend from Wisconsin.

Mr. SCHNEIDER of Wisconsin. In a week or so we are going to vote a lot of money here for the purpose of getting out of this depression. Does not the gentleman agree that

many of these items were arbitrarily reduced by the Bureau of the Budget beyond a reasonable reduction?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. No, Mr. Chairman, it is an entirely different proposition. We will shortly be called on to vote on a relief measure appropriating a very large sum, but under vastly different circumstances. In voting relief we are voting because there is no alternative. We are at war with adverse economic conditions which make relief indispensable. We have no choice in the matter. We cannot debate starvation. But in voting on these amendments we are free agents. They are purely business propositions. And since the beginning of recorded history elemental business principles have required rigid economy in expenditures exceeding incomes whether public or private.

And every dollar carried in these amendments is an appropriation beyond our national income.

Every dollar you are about to add to this bill will have to be borrowed. According to the latest and most authoritative estimates the deficit, as of the present date, is in excess of three and a half billion dollars. We have already spent over three and a half billion dollars more than the national revenues for the year.

So, Mr. Chairman, when you vote for these amendments you are not merely voting to appropriate money, you are voting to borrow money. You are not merely voting to spend money for cattle ticks, Bang's disease, and wildlife and free farms, but you are voting to increase a deficit already so large it staggers human comprehension. You are voting to add to the national debt, already the greatest national debt in the annals of international finance. You are voting to abandon every assurance of drastic economy given by every party in every national convention in the last decade.

These amendments do not provide for essentials. They are not indispensable. They do not even provide appreciable employment in comparison with roads, public buildings, and similar projects. Let me repeat, a vote for these amendments is a vote to borrow millions of dollars we have not got and never will have from present revenues; a vote to appropriate millions over the Budget; a vote to add millions to the national deficit; a vote to add millions to the national debt.

Let us take a sober second thought. Let us give Uncle Sam a break. If there is any doubt about these amendments, let us resolve that doubt in favor of the Government, in favor of the Treasury, in favor of the unborn generations which some bitter day will have to pay back every dollar we are voting to appropriate this afternoon.

Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

Mr. IGLESIAS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to return to page 16 to correct an omission that has been made in regard to a statute passed by the Congress. That has been omitted.

The CHAIRMAN. The Resident Commissioner from Puerto Rico asks unanimous consent to return to page 16 for the purpose of offering an amendment. Is there objection?

Mr. BOILEAU. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the right to object, and I shall not object after the paragraph under consideration is disposed of, but the paragraph beginning on page 97 and ending on page 98 is still open to amendment. After that is disposed of, I shall have no objection.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I have no objection to the gentleman discussing his amendment, but I much regret that under the rules of procedure I am compelled to object to returning to the item at this time.

The CHAIRMAN. Objection is heard.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

Mr. BOILEAU and Mr. WITHROW rose.

The CHAIRMAN. For what purpose does the gentleman from Wisconsin rise?

Mr. WITHROW. I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I rise to a point of order. At the beginning of the session of the Committee of the Whole this afternoon, the Chairman, the gentleman from

Missouri [Mr. CANNON], asked unanimous consent that after the conclusion of the bill he might have 10 minutes in which to close the debate. That is tantamount to an agreement that debate should close with the use of the 10 minutes by the chairman of the subcommittee.

I therefore insist on it, because all debate on the bill has been closed.

Mr. BOILEAU. Mr. Chairman, I desire to be heard on the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will hear the gentleman.

Mr. BOILEAU. I submit, Mr. Chairman, that the paragraph beginning on page 97, line 25, and ending with line 16 on page 98, is still open for amendment. This paragraph was the last paragraph of the bill for consideration. It was read and certain amendments were offered. Immediately upon the adoption of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] the gentleman from Missouri got the floor and started to talk without making any motion, without moving to close debate on the paragraph, and without any announcement from the Chair stating that debate had closed on the paragraph; and even though the gentleman from Missouri got the floor at that time as he probably could have gotten it at a later time, it does not foreclose Members from offering amendments to the paragraph. There was no announcement to the effect that all debate on the bill had closed, and there is neither rhyme nor reason for precluding the gentleman from Wisconsin from talking for 5 minutes on a motion to strike out the last two words of this paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state that the gentleman from Missouri was recognized for 10 minutes under previous order, and that this concluded all debate on the bill.

Mr. BOILEAU. A point of order, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. BOILEAU. I make the point of order that the stenographic record will not show that the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union recognized the gentleman from Missouri pursuant to the former request made by him or the former order entered, and there was no notice served on the Members that the gentleman from Missouri was talking as a result of permission received earlier. The Chair did not state that the gentleman was recognized pursuant to the former order, and there was no reason for anyone to assume that the gentleman from Missouri was taking the last 10 minutes of debate, nor will the RECORD show any reason so to assume. I submit that the gentleman from Wisconsin is entitled to recognition because this paragraph is still open to debate.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, to the contrary, the Chair recognized the gentleman from Missouri without his asking for recognition saying that it was in conformity with the previous order of the Committee.

Mr. BOILEAU. I will agree to that.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri is correct. The Chair proceeded under the agreement previously entered into.

The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Missouri that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the Chair, Mr. NELSON, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 10238) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture and for the Farm Credit Administration for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1939, and for other purposes, directed him to report the same back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill and all amendments to final passage.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Missouri moves the previous question on the bill and all amendments to final passage.

Mr. BOILEAU. Mr. Speaker, a point of order.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state his point of order.

Mr. BOILEAU. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will count. [After counting.] One hundred and forty-three Members are present, not a quorum.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 59]

Amlie	Evans	McClellan	Ryan
Anderson, Mo.	Fish	McCormack	Sabath
Andrews	Fitzpatrick	McFarlane	Schuetz
Arnold	Flaherty	McGranery	Schulte
Atkinson	Flannery	McKeough	Scott
Barden	Fleger	McSweeney	Sirovich
Barton	Ford, Calif.	Maas	Smith, Okla.
Beam	Frey, Pa.	Magnuson	Smith, Wash.
Bell	Fries, Ill.	Maloney	Smith, W. Va.
Boehne	Gasque	Mansfield	Snell
Boykin	Gingery	Martin, Mass.	Snyder, Pa.
Boylan, N. Y.	Green	Mason	Somers, N. Y.
Buckley, N. Y.	Greenwood	Mead	Starnes
Byrne	Griswold	Mills	Steagall
Caldwell	Hamilton	Mitchell, Ill.	Sullivan
Cannon, Wis.	Hancock, N. C.	Mouton	Sumners, Tex.
Carter	Harlan	Nichols	Swope
Champion	Harrington	Norton	Taylor, S. C.
Chandler	Harter	O'Brien, Ill.	Thomas, N. J.
Clason	Hartley	O'Brien, Mich.	Thompson, Ill.
Claypool	Healey	O'Connell, Mont.	Thurston
Cole, Md.	Hennings	O'Connor, Mont.	Tobey
Cooley	Hill	O'Connor, N. Y.	Towey
Costello	Hoffman	O'Day	Vincent, B. M.
Crosby	Honeyman	O'Malley	Wallgren
Culkin	Izac	Pettengill	Weaver
Delaney	Jenckes, Ind.	Pfeifer	Welch
Disney	Kelly, Ill.	Phillips	Wene
Ditter	Kocalkowski	Plumley	Whelchel
Dockweller	Kramer	Powers	White, Idaho
Douglas	Lemke	Reece, Tenn.	White, Ohio
Eaton	Lewis, Md.	Rellly	Wilcox
Edmiston	McAndrews	Robison, Ky.	Wolcott

The SPEAKER. Two hundred and ninety-three Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

On motion of Mr. CANNON of Missouri, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] that the previous question be ordered on the bill and amendments to final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask for a separate vote on the amendment appearing on page 25, having to do with Bang's disease; the amendment on page 27, with regard to cattle ticks; the amendment on page 68, with regard to wildlife; and the amendment on page 95, offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. JOHNSON], providing for an increase in the farm tenancy allowance.

The SPEAKER. Is a separate vote demanded on any of the other amendments? If not, the Chair will put them in gross.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the first amendment on which a separate vote is demanded.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 25, line 15, strike out "\$1,603,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$5,403,000."

Mr. FULLER. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. FULLER. The Members of the House cannot understand the amendment to which reference has just been made.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the Clerk will again report the amendment.

Mr. FULLER. We heard the Clerk report the amendment, but it deals with figures only. Which amendment is it commonly known as? Is this the Bang's disease amendment?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Missouri stated this was the amendment increasing the appropriation for the eradication of Bang's disease.

Mr. FULLER. That is what we want to know.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. CANNON of Missouri) there were—ayes 167, noes 51.

So the amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment on which a separate vote is demanded.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 27, line 12, strike out "\$503,940" and insert in lieu thereof "\$903,940"; and in line 22, strike out the period, insert a colon and the following: "Provided further, That of the sum \$903,940, \$400,000 shall be available for eradication of cattle ticks in States only where the Secretary of Agriculture has satisfactory assurance that there is emergency need for additional funds for this purpose."

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. KLEBERG and Mr. LANHAM) there were—ayes 56, noes 86.

So the amendment was rejected.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment on which a separate vote is demanded.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 68, line 22, after the period, insert a new paragraph reading as follows:

"FEDERAL AID IN WILDLIFE RESTORATION"

"For carrying out the provisions of the act entitled 'An act to provide that the United States shall aid the States in wildlife restoration projects, and for other purposes,' approved September 2, 1937 (50 Stat. 917), \$1,000,000: *Provided*, That expenditures hereunder shall not exceed the aggregate receipts covered into the Treasury under the provisions of said act."

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. CANNON of Missouri) there were—ayes 163, noes 41.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Missouri object to the vote on the ground a quorum is not present?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I do, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will count. [After counting.] Two hundred and thirty-eight Members are present, a quorum.

So the amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment on which a separate vote has been demanded.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 95, line 24, after the word "act", strike out "\$15,000,000" and insert "\$25,000,000."

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma and Mr. WOOD) there were—ayes 71, noes 101.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma and Mr. WOOD demanded the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 149, nays 154, not voting 125, as follows:

[Roll No. 60]

YEAS—149

Aleshire	Burdick	Crowe	Elliott
Allen, La.	Carlson	Deen	Farley
Allen, Pa.	Cartwright	Dempsey	Flannagan
Bernard	Case, S. Dak.	DeMuth	Ford, Miss.
Bigelow	Chapman	DeRouen	Fuller
Binderup	Clark, Idaho	Dies	Fulmer
Bolleau	Coffee, Wash.	Dowell	Garrett
Boren	Collins	Doxey	Gehrman
Brooks	Colmer	Driver	Gilchrist
Brown	Cooper	Duncan	Gildea
Buckler, Minn.	Creal	Dunn	Gray, Ind.

Greever	Lanham	Owen	Shannon
Gregory	Long	Pace	Sheppard
Griffith	Lucas	Parsons	Sirovich
Harrington	Luckey, Nebr.	Patman	Smith, Wash.
Havener	Luecke, Mich.	Patterson	South
Hildebrandt	McCormack	Patton	Sparkman
Hill	McFarlane	Pearson	Spence
Hobbs	McGrath	Peterson, Fla.	Stefan
Hope	McReynolds	Pierce	Teigan
Houston	McSweeney	Poage	Terry
Hull	Magnuson	Ramsay	Thomas, Tex.
Hunter	Mahon, S. C.	Ramspeck	Thomason, Tex.
Imhoff	Mahon, Tex.	Randolph	Tolan
Izac	Mansfield	Rankin	Turner
Jacobsen	Martin, Colo.	Rees, Kans.	Vincent, B. M.
Johnson, Luther A.	Massingale	Richards	Vinson, Fred M.
Johnson, Lyndon	Maverick	Rigney	Vinson, Ga.
Johnson, Minn.	May	Rogers, Okla.	Voorhis
Johnson, Okla.	Mead	Romjue	Wallgren
Johnson, W. Va.	Meeks	Ryan	Wearin
Jones	Mills	Sadowski	Withrow
Keller	Mitchell, Tenn.	Sanders	Wolverton
Kerr	Mouton	Sauthoff	Wood
Kitchens	Murdock, Ariz.	Schaefer, Ill.	Zimmerman
Kniffin	Murdock, Utah	Schneider, Wis.	
Kopplemann	Nelson	Scruggam	
Kvale	O'Connell, Mont.	Shanley	

NAYS—154

Allen, Del.	Dirksen	Kinzer	Robinson, Utah
Allen, Ill.	Dixon	Kirwan	Rockefeller
Andresen, Minn.	Dondero	Kleberg	Rogers, Mass.
Arends	Dorsey	Knutson	Rutherford
Ashbrook	Doughton	Lambertson	Sacks
Bacon	Drew, Pa.	Lambertson	Satterfield
Barry	Drewry, Va.	Lanzetta	Secrest
Bates	Eberharter	Leavy	Seger
Belter	Eckert	Lesinski	Shafer, Mich.
Biermann	Elcher	Lewis, Colo.	Short
Bland	Engel	Lord	Simpson
Bloom	Englebright	Luce	Smith, Conn.
Boland, Pa.	Fitzgerald	Ludlow	Smith, Maine
Boyer	Fitzpatrick	McLaughlin	Smith, Va.
Bradley	Fletcher	McMillan	Snell
Brewster	Forand	Maas	Snyder, Pa.
Buck	Gamble, N. Y.	Mapes	Sutphin
Bulwinkle	Gambrill, Md.	Merritt	Sweeney
Byrne	Gasque	Michener	Taber
Cannon, Mo.	Gearhart	Mitchell, Ill.	Tarver
Casey, Mass.	Gifford	Moser, Pa.	Taylor, Colo.
Celler	Goldsborough	Mosier, Ohio	Taylor, Tenn.
Church	Gray, Pa.	Mott	Thom
Citron	Gwynne	O'Connell, R. I.	Tinkham
Clark, N. C.	Haines	O'Leary	Transue
Cluett	Halleck	Oliver	Treadway
Cochran	Hancock, N. Y.	O'Neal, Ky.	Unstead
Coffee, Nebr.	Hart	O'Neill, N. J.	Wadsworth
Cole, N. Y.	Healey	O'Toole	Walter
Connery	Holmes	Palmisano	Warren
Cravens	Hook	Peterson, Ga.	West
Crawford	Jarman	Powers	White, Ohio
Crosser	Jarrett	Rabaut	Wigglesworth
Crowther	Jenkins, Ohio	Rayburn	Williams
Cullen	Jenks, N. H.	Reed, Ill.	Wolfenden
Cummings	Kee	Reed, N. Y.	Woodruff
Curley	Kelly, N. Y.	Reilly	Woodrum
Daly	Kennedy, Md.	Rich	
Dickstein	Keogh	Robertson	

NOT VOTING—125

Amle	Douglas	Kocalkowski	Reece, Tenn.
Anderson, Mo.	Eaton	Kramer	Robson, Ky.
Andrews	Edmiston	Lamneck	Sabath
Arnold	Evans	Larrabee	Schuetz
Atkinson	Faddis	Lea	Schulte
Barden	Ferguson	Lemke	Scott
Barton	Fernandez	Lewis, Md.	Smith, Okla.
Beam	Fish	McAndrews	Smith, W. Va.
Bell	Flaherty	McClellan	Somers, N. Y.
Boehne	Flannery	McGehee	Stack
Boykin	Fleger	McGranery	Starnes
Boylan, N. Y.	Ford, Calif.	McGroarty	Stegall
Buckley, N. Y.	Frey, Pa.	McKeough	Sullivan
Burch	Fries, Ill.	McLean	Sumners, Tex.
Caldwell	Gavagan	Maloney	Swope
Cannon, Wis.	Gingery	Martin, Mass.	Taylor, S. C.
Carter	Green	Mason	Thomas, N. J.
Champlin	Greenwood	Nichols	Thompson, Ill.
Chandler	Griswold	Norton	Thurston
Clason	Guyer	O'Brien, Ill.	Tobey
Claypool	Hamilton	O'Brien, Mich.	Towey
Cole, Md.	Hancock, N. C.	O'Connor, Mont.	Weaver
Cooley	Harlan	O'Connor, N. Y.	Welch
Costello	Harter	O'Day	Wene
Cox	Hartley	O'Malley	Welchel
Crosby	Hendricks	Patrick	White, Idaho
Culkin	Hennings	Pettengill	Whittington
Delaney	Hoffman	Pfeiffer	Wilcox
Dell	Honeyman	Phillips	Wolcott
Disney	Jenckes, Ind.	Plumley	
Ditter	Kelly, Ill.	Polk	
Dockweiler	Kennedy, N. Y.	Quinn	

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:
On the vote:

Mr. Amlie (for) with Mr. Hamilton (against).
Mr. Lemke (for) with Mr. Thomas of New Jersey (against).
Mr. O'Malley (for) with Mr. Ditter (against).

General pairs:

Mr. O'Connor of New York with Mr. Martin of Massachusetts.
Mr. Whittington with Mr. Eaton.
Mr. Steagall with Mr. Carter.
Mr. Cooley with Mr. Guyer.
Mr. Sullivan with Mr. Reece of Tennessee.
Mr. Beam with Mr. Tobey.
Mr. Greenwood with Mr. Fish.
Mr. Burch with Mr. Hartley.
Mr. Cox with Mr. Barton.
Mr. McAndrews with Mr. Wolcott.
Mr. Kennedy of New York with Mr. Mason.
Mr. Maloney with Mr. Hoffman.
Mr. Boehne with Mr. Culin.
Mr. Fernandez with Mr. McLean.
Mr. Gavagan with Mr. Douglas.
Mr. Thompson of Illinois with Mr. Clason.
Mr. Weaver with Mr. Robson of Kentucky.
Mr. Griswold with Mr. Andrews.
Mr. Kramer with Mr. Plumley.
Mr. Lamneck with Mr. Welch.
Mr. Frey of Pennsylvania with Mr. Arnold.
Mrs. Norton with Mr. Gingery.
Mr. Taylor of South Carolina with Mr. Buckley of New York.
Mr. Summers of Texas with Mr. Disney.
Mr. Patrick with Mr. Hancock of North Carolina.
Mr. Schuetz with Mr. Ferguson.
Mrs. Jenckes of Indiana with Mr. Stack.
Mr. Towey with Mr. Fries of Illinois.
Mr. Atkinson with Mr. McGranery.
Mr. Bell with Mr. O'Brien of Illinois.
Mr. Harlan with Mr. Hendricks.
Mr. Polk with Mr. Welch.
Mr. Barden with Mr. Flaherty.
Mr. Scott with Mr. Pfeifer.
Mr. Delaney with Mr. Lea.
Mr. White of Idaho with Mr. McKeough.
Mr. Anderson of Missouri with Mr. Flannery.
Mr. Nichols with Mr. O'Brien of Michigan.
Mr. Boykin with Mr. Harter.
Mr. Green with Mr. O'Connor of Montana.
Mr. Boylan of New York with Mr. Wilcox.
Mr. Pettengill with Mr. Caldwell.
Mr. Hennings with Mr. Crosby.
Mr. Phillips with Mr. Chandler.
Mr. Claypool with Mr. Quinn.
Mr. Schulte with Mr. Costello.
Mr. Kelly of Illinois with Mr. Larrabee.
Mr. Cole of Maryland with Mr. Kocialkowski.
Mr. Evans with Mr. Starnes.
Mr. Dockweller with Mr. Swope.
Mr. Somers of New York with Mr. Lewis of Maryland.
Mr. Faddis with Mr. Smith of Oklahoma.
Mr. Dingell with Mr. McClellan.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. SADOWSKI and Mr. IMHOFF changed their votes from "nay" to "yea."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. CANNON of Missouri, a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members who spoke on the Agricultural Department Appropriation bill, 1939, may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks in the RECORD on the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a newspaper article upon a distinguished constituent.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROBERTSON and Mr. VOORHIS asked and were given permission to extend their own remarks in the RECORD.

CHARLES J. COLDEN

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to spread upon the record at this point resolutions adopted this morning by the Committee on Merchant Marine and

Fisheries on the life and services of Hon. CHARLES J. COLDEN, expressing sympathy for his death.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

The resolutions referred to are as follows:

Whereas the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries finds its personnel reduced by the loss of one of its most diligent and faithful members and notes with sorrow the presence of a vacant chair to which its former occupant will not return: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, First, that this committee recognizes in the death of Hon. CHARLES J. COLDEN, Representative from the Seventeenth District of California and a member of this committee, the loss of a devoted public servant, a faithful Representative, a loyal American, a sterling patriot, and a loving friend whose record in Congress was marked by industry, ability, fidelity, and zeal, and whose sound judgment and signal ability were of inestimable benefit to this committee in all of its deliberations;

Second, that this committee will ever cherish the memory of its association with Mr. COLDEN and will find in the patience, intelligence, and zeal with which he served an example and inspiration;

Third, that this committee extends to the district which Mr. COLDEN served and to the family which survives him its deepest sympathy in their sorrow; and

Fourth, that these resolutions shall be spread upon the records of this committee, that a request be made to have this resolution made a part of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and that a copy shall be sent to the family of the deceased.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. ROGERS of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Indian Affairs may be discharged from the further consideration of the bills S. 3166 and H. R. 10126, to amend section 2139 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, and that the bills may be referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BOREN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. SMITH] may have permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. MCSWEENEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by including some statements by my fellow townsman, Mr. Steiner, with reference to the transcontinental highway.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF CIVIL SERVICE TO INCLUDE POSTMASTERS

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 1531) extending the classified civil service to include postmasters of the first, second, and third classes, and for other purposes, with a Senate amendment, disagree to the Senate amendment, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

Mr. BACON. I object, Mr. Speaker.

COAST GUARD

The SPEAKER. The Chair lays before the House a request from the Senate.

The Clerk read as follows:

JANUARY 5 (CALENDAR DAY, APRIL 7), 1938.

Ordered, That the Secretary be directed to request the House of Representatives to return to the Senate the bill (S. 2206) to provide for the transfer of enlisted men of the Coast Guard to the Coast Guard Reserve.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the request will be granted.

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Thursday next, after the disposition of the business on the Speaker's table and following the legislative

program of the day, I may be permitted to address the House for 20 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

MEMORIAL TO THE LATE GUGLIELMO MARCONI

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, there is space in Washington for a memorial to an outstanding man. I am proud to rise in support of House Joint Resolution 499, to authorize the erection of a memorial to the late Guglielmo Marconi.

The Marconi Memorial Foundation, Inc., headed by the outstanding Italian-American editor, Gr. UFF Generoso Pope, and including among its members many prominent Americans, has offered to donate a suitable monument.

Signor Marconi was an inventive genius, surpassed by few, if any, the world has ever known. As such he is rightfully entitled to be suitably honored by the citizens of the United States. He belonged to us, as to his native land, and might better be called a citizen of the world. His fame is limitless, as is the area covered by his great inventions of wireless telegraphy and radio. His life, too, is typical of a great person.

He was born at Bologna, Italy, on April 25, 1874. At an early age he showed his ability in science and mathematics and at the early age of 21 he believed electric waves could be transmitted great distances through the air. He was fortunate at this time to be privileged to study under Prof. Augusto Righi.

At Marconi's father's house, Villa di Pontecchio, near Bologna were built what were the world's first wireless telegraph stations. Constant application and improvement were crowned with success with the opening on October 16, 1907, of a regular wireless telegraph service between the United States and Europe.

From wireless telegraphy—transmitting sounds—Signor Marconi moved ahead until in 1924 he transmitted the human voice in short waves from England to Australia, a distance of 10,500 miles.

With the development of this great invention the world was made small, distance was dissolved, and world-wide interchange of thought made possible. To the genius who was the inventor came many honors from his own native Italy, from the United States, from the world. His King made him a marquis, his people elected him to the Senate. Every country decorated him, and the universities of Bologna, Columbia, Oxford, Cambridge, and many others conferred honorary degrees. In 1909 he divided the Nobel scientific award for physics and received many other awards and medals from honorary and scientific societies. In 1928 he was elected president of the National Research Council of Rome and in 1930 president of the Royal Academy of Italy. He was fittingly honored by the world's fair at Chicago, to which he was invited by the United States. October 2, 1933, was dedicated, at the fair, as Marconi Day as a mark of respect and admiration to the great inventor.

Mr. Speaker, there is space in Washington for a memorial to Senator Guglielmo Marconi. There is space here thus to honor fittingly a distinguished life spent in serving and benefitting mankind, and there is space here thus to show the deep respect we hold for this great son of Italy, and through him to show abiding respect for the many other citizens of that country who, having come here, have spent their lives in serving and benefiting their fellow man and making ideal citizens of the United States.

Mr. Speaker, House Joint Resolution 499 has received favorable consideration, and I was happy to join my colleague the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. LANZETTA] in urging favorable action by the President.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record by including therein a brief article written by one of the outstanding citizens of my district, George Ade, for the Greenwich Times, of Greenwich, Conn.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

WAR DEPARTMENT CIVIL FUNCTIONS APPROPRIATION BILL, 1939

Mr. SNYDER of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 10291) making appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1939, for civil functions administered by the War Department, and for other purposes; and pending that, I ask unanimous consent that general debate on the bill may run along for the remainder of the day, the time to be equally divided between the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. POWERS] and myself. On Thursday when we take up the consideration of this bill we can decide how long general debate shall continue.

Mr. POWERS. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, may I suggest to the gentleman from Pennsylvania that we agree that general debate continue for 2 hours today. Of course, there will be no general debate on this bill tomorrow. May I further suggest that general debate continue on Thursday until 2 o'clock, and that at 2 o'clock the reading of the bill be started? I also suggest that the time be equally divided and controlled by the gentleman from Pennsylvania and myself.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Pennsylvania modify his request to provide that general debate on the bill continue for 2 hours today, to be equally divided and controlled by the gentleman from New Jersey and himself, and that general debate conclude at 2 o'clock on Thursday, the time to be equally divided and controlled by the gentleman from New Jersey and himself?

Mr. SNYDER of Pennsylvania. I so modify my request, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 10291, with Mr. DOXEY in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. POWERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. ENGEL].

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Chairman, some 2 years ago there was attached to the civil functions bill of the War Department a rider providing for the selection of a site and the erection of two palaces for the High Commissioner of the Philippine Islands.

During the hearings on this bill, with the help of some of my able friends on the committee from both sides of the aisle, I asked the High Commissioner, Mr. McNutt, about the ground upon which these palaces are to be built and who was responsible for the selection of the ground and the erection of these two palaces. I found that when the Tydings-McDuffie Act was passed it provided for turning over to the Philippine government the great palace which the Governor General occupied. This was the last thing, I think, we had left for the \$20,000,000 we paid for the Philippine Islands. The Philippine government was supposed to furnish us with a site upon which to build a new palace somewhere in Manila. When it came to the selection of this site the Philippine government, with the aid of the then Governor General or the High Commissioner later on, selected 17 acres of Manila Bay, and we are now just completing the making of 17 acres of land. We have built a

sea wall that is more than 1,700 feet long in some 38 feet of water with the foundation beneath the bottom of the bay, and filled that in with 45 feet of dirt, at a cost of \$75,000.

I want to read the testimony of Commissioner McNutt before our committee:

Mr. ENGEL. The \$55,000 is for what?

Mr. McNUTT. For a sea wall.

Mr. ENGEL. Is that the place where they were making land?

Mr. McNUTT. Yes; the site of the High Commissioner's residence in Manila is made land, made out of the bottom of Manila Bay.

Mr. ENGEL. How much is it costing to make that land?

Mr. McNUTT. It is costing us around \$75,000.

Mr. ENGEL. How much land are you making there?

Mr. McNUTT. Seventeen acres.

Mr. ENGEL. In other words, you are making 17 acres of land where the ocean now is?

Mr. McNUTT. We are making it of what is now Manila Bay.

Mr. ENGEL. To get a residence for the High Commissioner?

Mr. McNUTT. That is right.

Mr. ENGEL. On the 17 acres of made land, at a cost of \$75,000, we are adding this one residence at Manila?

Mr. McNUTT. That is right. That is as of December 31, the total expenditure including the plans for the building amounted to \$87,275.

Mr. ENGEL. What about the balance?

Mr. McNUTT. The balance of \$75,631 was expended or obligated in Manila for the construction of the sea wall and the fill. The pumping was done by the Philippine Commonwealth.

Mr. TERRY. Why was it necessary to have this residence in that particular place?

Mr. McNUTT. That is one question I wish I could answer. I quite agree with you.

Mr. ENGEL. Was there not some other place available?

Mr. McNUTT. There was not any question about it. I do not know how it was selected.

Mr. TERRY. Who selected the site?

Mr. McNUTT. I suppose it was selected by my predecessor.

Mr. ENGEL. There are a lot of other sites that would have been available?

Mr. McNUTT. If I had been choosing a site, there is one of the other sites I would have chosen.

Mr. ENGEL. At what expense?

Mr. McNUTT. At no expense. We owned it.

Mr. ENGEL. In other words, we had other sites available that we owned, on which we could have put this residence, without an expenditure?

Mr. McNUTT. That is right.

Mr. ENGEL. Did not the fact that it was close to the center of activities have something to do with it?

Mr. McNUTT. I suppose there were those possibilities. For example, that question was not for me to decide; when I got there it was almost completed.

Mr. ENGEL. I am not holding you responsible.

Mr. McNUTT. I do not know what reason brought about the final decision to put it there. You asked me the question; whether there was another site that I would have liked better. I think Occupation Point, which was the first place where the flag went up, would have been ideal, and how it happened to be passed up for this site, I do not know.

Mr. ENGEL. We owned that point?

Mr. McNUTT. We could have had anything we wanted. There may have been reasons; I am not gainsaying that.

Mr. DOWELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ENGEL. I yield.

Mr. DOWELL. Who was the commissioner who made the selection of the site?

Mr. ENGEL. Governor Murphy, of Michigan.

Then I wrote the State Department about the matter, but, first, Admiral Peoples came over, with two assistants, and then the Assistant Secretary of State, with an assistant, and they passed the buck to the War Department, and then the War Department wrote me as follows:

The question of securing a suitable site for an office and residence in Manila was taken up by this Bureau with Governor General Murphy, who, after a careful survey of various locations, decided that a site in the general area of the Luneta, Dewey Boulevard, was most suitable for our requirements.

There is no question but what Governor Murphy was the man who recommended this site and recommended that the War Department go out there and spend \$75,000. To put a sea wall in 38 feet of water and build 17 acres of land is an outrage, but that is not the end of it. They are building a palace there and I asked for the plans of the palace. I have them here with me and I want to tell you something about that.

This palace, Mr. Chairman, is actually 263 feet long and 183 feet wide, taking in all the wings, but, taking the Treasury Department figures and excluding the wings, it is 203 feet long, or 33 feet longer than the White House. It is 134 feet wide, or 49 feet wider than the White House. Can you imagine building a palace over there that is 33 feet longer and 49 feet wider than the White House? I am taking the figures of the Congressional Library for the dimensions of the White House. The White House has 18 acres of land, while this will have 17 acres of made ground, and the palace itself covers very nearly an acre of ground.

This palace has a total of approximately 86 rooms, loggias, halls, and what not. It has 19 lodges, loggias, and so forth, which are from 9½ to 13 feet wide, and in the aggregate 825 feet long, all lounges. They must have a lot of lounge lizards over there.

Now, let me describe the palace there. It has a ballroom in it and the dance floor. Just the floor where they dance is 40 feet wide and 65 feet long and two stories high. I think that would make a pretty good-sized farmer's barn.

It has two alcoves or lounges 9½ feet wide by 65 feet long, with a reception hall 13 feet wide and 62 feet long. Think of it! This all goes with the ballroom, and they tell us we are getting out of the Philippine Islands.

This palace has a library 22 feet wide and 30 feet long, two stories high. It has a banquet hall 22 feet by 40 feet, two stories high. It has a study 14 feet by 13 feet, all this on the first floor. Two foyers, 12 feet by 22 feet each. Two loggias, 9½ feet by 44 feet each. Entrance lobby, 15 feet by 62 feet. Entrance loggia, 6 feet by 59 feet. Kitchen, 14 feet by 24 feet. Pantry, 7 feet by 13½ feet. Storeroom, 7 feet by 10 feet. Powder room, 8 feet by 13 feet. Private dining room, 18 feet by 23 feet. Vestibule, 9½ by 9½ feet. Another foyer, 10 feet by 22 feet. Passageway, 8 feet by 22 feet. Entrance loggia, 9½ feet by 41 feet. Porte cochère, 15 feet by 15 feet. Women's checkroom, 10 feet by 23 feet. Two anterooms, 10 feet by 11 feet each. Men's checkroom, 8 feet by 22 feet. Porter's room, 12 feet by 22 feet. Anteroom, 7 feet by 13 feet. Men's checkroom, 9 feet by 13 feet. Five toilet rooms, seating capacity 20. First floor has 37 rooms, loggias, foyers, and so forth, but not including office space.

Now, we shall take the mezzanine floor. There is another library also on the mezzanine floor. They have one on the first floor 32 by 30, and then one on the mezzanine floor 12 by 22. In all there are 20 rooms, loggias, foyers, and so forth, on the mezzanine floor. On the second floor they have 12 bedrooms, several bathrooms, a sitting room 20 by 30, a trunk storage room, and what not. There are 19 rooms, halls, and so forth on the second floor. Altogether there are 86 rooms, halls, and loggias in this palace that we are building at a cost of \$500,000 on this 17 acres of land. Then think what it will cost to go down through 45 feet of fill to the bottom of Manila Bay, and then down beyond that for the foundations of this building that we are constructing. It is an outrage.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ENGEL. Yes.

Mr. STEFAN. The gentleman remembers that I appeared before his committee nearly every year for the past 3 years, protesting against the useless expenditure of the taxpayers' money in the Philippine Islands. The gentleman will also recall that I called the attention of his committee to the useless expenditure of nonmilitary appropriations in the islands; also I called the attention of the committee to useless expenditure of \$15,000,000 in the Philippine Islands and wondered why the gentleman's committee has not seen fit to reduce expenditures as I have suggested so many times, not only in the gentleman's committee but on the floor of the House, calling attention of the Members to the very same thing which the gentleman is pointing out today.

Mr. ENGEL. I am not presuming to talk for the committee, but I say the time has come when we ought to pull out of the Philippine Islands. I say that it is ridiculous and absurd to increase our Navy by a billion two hundred million

dollars just because the Philippine Islands want us to protect them. We got a lemon in the first place, and we have it now, and we will have it as long as we have control of the Philippine Islands.

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ENGEL. Yes.

Mr. TREADWAY. Did the gentleman give us any figures as to the final cost of this elaborate home of the High Commissioner?

Mr. ENGEL. The estimate is \$500,000. They have to go down through that 45-foot fill to what was the bottom of Manila Bay and sink the foundations for this building below that, and that and the palace will cost a great deal more than \$500,000. When they get through furnishing these palaces, the cost will be increased still more. Then will come the tremendous cost of maintaining the building after it is finished.

Mr. TREADWAY. How much longer are we supposed to have any control over the Philippines?

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. McNutt, as I understood him, wants us to keep the Philippines.

Mr. TREADWAY. What does the present law provide?

Mr. ENGEL. Eight years from now.

Mr. TREADWAY. And how long will it take to build this wonderful residence?

Mr. ENGEL. I do not know, but I should say a couple of years.

Mr. TREADWAY. Then it will not be to exceed 5 years that the Commissioner would occupy it.

Mr. ENGEL. But they are going to keep him there as Ambassador. Mr. McNutt, who is the High Commissioner, as I understand it, wants to be President of the United States, and, if he should be elected, I am afraid that the first thing that he will want to do will be to tear down the White House because it is too small, because if he needs a building that is 33 feet wider and 65 feet longer than the White House as Lord High Commissioner of the Philippines, the White House will be too small for him when he gets in there as President—if he ever does.

Mr. TREADWAY. I happened to have been one of the party that went to the Philippine Islands 2 years ago, and it was astonishing to me that our Government ever agreed to give up the home of the then Resident Commissioner and turn it over to the Filipinos. It was a fine big residence, as all you gentlemen know who were on that trip. And whoever is running this and wants these appropriations is asking the Government to build something they need not have the expense of, if they had retained the beautiful palace that belonged to this Government at that time.

Mr. ENGEL. Oh, I do not quite agree with the gentleman about giving the palace away for nothing. We got 17 acres of Manila Bay and 38 feet of water for the palace.

Mr. TREADWAY. And what kind of a trade would the gentleman from Michigan call that—salt water for a high-grade house?

Mr. ENGEL. Well, we are getting water for it.

Mr. TREADWAY. We got water in front and water behind.

Mr. LORD. The gentleman has neglected to state that they also got a palace at Baguio.

Mr. ENGEL. I am coming to that. So much for the palace in Manila Bay. They are not satisfied with this palace of 86 rooms and loggias and halls and what not. But let me insert here the list of rooms in the Manila palace:

DESCRIPTION OF ROOMS AND SPACE OF THE PALACE BEING BUILT FOR THE LORD HIGH COMMISSIONER OF THE PHILIPPINES AT MANILA

First floor: Ballroom—Dance floor, 40 feet by 65 feet, two stories high; two alcoves or lounges, 9½ feet by 65 feet each; reception hall, 13 feet by 62 feet; library, 22 feet by 30 feet, two stories high; banquet hall, 22 feet by 40 feet, two stories high; study, 14 feet by 13 feet; two foyers, 12 feet by 22 feet each; two loggias, 9½ feet by 44 feet each; entrance lobby, 15 feet by 62 feet; entrance loggia, 6 feet by 59 feet; kitchen, 14 feet by 24 feet; pantry, 7 feet by 13½ feet; storeroom, 7 feet by 10 feet; powder room, 8 feet by 13 feet; private dining room, 18 feet by 23 feet; vestibule,

9½ feet by 9½ feet; another foyer, 10 feet by 22 feet; passageway, 8 feet by 22 feet; entrance loggia, 9½ feet by 41 feet; porte cochère, 15 feet by 15 feet; women's checkroom, 10 feet by 23 feet; two anterooms, 10 feet by 11 feet each; men's checkroom, 8 feet by 22 feet; porter's room, 12 feet by 22 feet; anteroom, 7 feet by 13 feet; men's checkroom, 9 feet by 13 feet; 5 toilets, seating capacity, 20. First floor has 37 rooms, loggias, foyers, etc., not including office space.

Mezzanine floor: Another library, 12 feet by 22 feet; 2 bedrooms, 14 feet by 14 feet; 1 bedroom, 12 feet by 14 feet; 1 bedroom, 10 feet by 14 feet; storage room, 14 feet by 16 feet; storage room, 10 feet by 14 feet; storage room, 14 feet by 18 feet; passage, 8 feet by 22 feet; loggia, 20 feet by 22 feet; 2 loggias, 9½ feet by 65 feet; 2 loggias, 9½ feet by 44 feet; 1 loggia, 8 feet by 62 feet; foyer, 12 feet by 22 feet; 4 toilets, seating capacity of 12; 2 toilets, seating capacity not given; 20 rooms, loggias, foyers, passageways, etc., on this floor.

Second floor: 3 bedrooms, 15 feet by 22 feet; 3 bedrooms, 12 feet by 16 feet; 1 bedroom, 12 feet by 17 feet; 2 bathrooms, 6 feet by 8 feet; 3 bathrooms, 7 feet by 8 feet; bedroom, 15 feet by 22 feet; bath, 9 feet by 13 feet; dressing room, 9 feet by 13 feet; sitting room, 20 feet by 30 feet; hall, 5 feet by 35 feet; trunk storage, 9 feet by 12 feet; loggia, 5 feet by 15 feet. The second floor has 19 rooms, halls, loggias, etc. This floor has 7 baths or toilet rooms, seating capacity not given.

COMPARISON BETWEEN THE WHITE HOUSE AND HIGH COMMISSIONER'S PALACE

The palace is actually 263 feet long by 183 feet wide, taking in all wings, but taking Treasury Department's figures, it is 203 feet long, or 33 feet longer than the White House and 134 feet wide, or 49 feet wider than the White House; the White House being according to the figures furnished by the Congressional Library, 170 feet long and 85 feet wide.

The White House has 18 acres of ground, the palace 17.26 acres. This palace covers, over all, nearly an acre of ground.

This palace has a total of 18 toilets or bathrooms with seating capacity of approximately 43. It has 19 lounges, loggias, lobbies, foyers, etc., which are from 9½ feet to 13 feet wide and are in the aggregate 825 feet long—86 rooms, halls, etc.

They are not satisfied with this new palace out there.

Mr. TERRY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ENGEL. I yield.

Mr. TERRY. While the gentleman is making this interesting statement I wish he would convey the information to the committee that the item of this building and the home of the High Commissioner in the Philippines is not a matter that comes before this subcommittee; and this subcommittee had nothing whatever to do with the question of buildings, or of building this palace or this residence.

Mr. ENGEL. As I understand the facts—and I was not a member of the committee at the time—this item was added by the Senate. That is correct is it not?

Mr. TERRY. But it did not originate with this subcommittee.

Mr. ENGEL. No; it was added on to a deficiency bill, was it not?

Mr. TERRY. It was added to a deficiency bill.

Mr. ENGEL. It came from the Senate and was passed here without any hearings.

Mr. TERRY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. ENGEL. I yield.

Mr. TERRY. I just want the gentleman to tell us whether or not the matter that we are discussing now comes under this bill at all.

Mr. ENGEL. The Philippine government comes under the bill, and this is general debate.

Mr. TERRY. But this palace as the gentleman calls it that is being built over there is not a matter with which this committee has anything whatever to do; we were not called upon in regard to it at all.

Mr. ENGEL. It comes under the Insular Bureau of the War Department, which would be a part of the War Department appropriation bill and come before our committee; but this particular item was added on to a deficiency bill.

Mr. TERRY. And this committee had nothing to do with it.

Mr. ENGEL. Not with that item as the deficiency bill comes before a different subcommittee but the same full committee.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ENGEL. I yield.

Mr. STEFAN. It is a fact that the bill we are now discussing and debating contains appropriations for the non-military activities of the Philippines, including the expenses of the High Commissioner of the Philippines which are higher than the expenses of the Ambassador to England.

Mr. ENGEL. There is no question about it.

Mr. HOOK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ENGEL. I yield.

Mr. HOOK. Was it not a Republican administration that wished the Philippine Islands on us?

Mr. ENGEL. A Republican administration won the Spanish-American War, but it was a Democratic administration that passed the Tydings-McDuffie Act and gave away this palace, and it is the present Democratic administration that is building these two palaces now for the High Commissioner.

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ENGEL. I yield.

Mr. TREADWAY. Regardless of the merits of the controversy as to which committee is responsible for this item, the expense that is proposed comes upon the taxpayers of the country, does it not?

Mr. ENGEL. Yes.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ENGEL. I yield.

Mr. MICHENER. Should not the gentleman be a little more considerate, inasmuch as this building, this palace, the selection of the site was made by a Democratic High Commissioner who is now the Governor of Michigan?

Mr. ENGEL. The selection of the site was recommended by the present Governor of Michigan, but I do not know who recommended the palace. The plans were revised later.

Mr. TERRY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ENGEL. I yield.

Mr. TERRY. Is it not a fact that the Government of the United States did not own the residence that was formerly occupied by the Governor General of the Philippines?

Mr. ENGEL. I do not know about that. I understood that we owned it, that we received it from the Spanish Government. I may be mistaken about that, however.

Mr. TERRY. Has it not always been a fact that the expenses of the High Commissioner are less than the expenses of the Governor General under the Republican administration?

Mr. ENGEL. I do not think the Governor General ever paid any \$15,000 a year rent.

Mr. GIFFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ENGEL. I yield.

Mr. GIFFORD. The gentleman will agree, will he not, that this will give an excellent yardstick for other embassies?

Mr. ENGEL. I agree.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ENGEL. I yield.

Mr. RABAUT. The gentleman is greatly excited over something that does not appear to be connected with this particular bill. I really would suggest that if the people in that hot territory get as excited over the thing as he is getting here there might be some real need for those 40 sit-downs. Now, the Malacana Palace did not belong to the American Government at any time.

Mr. ENGEL. Does the gentleman justify the taking of it?

Mr. RABAUT. The gentleman ought to be sincere about it. The Malacana Palace never did belong to the American Government.

Mr. ENGEL. To whom did it belong?

Mr. RABAUT. It belonged to the Filipinos. The Filipinos have always owned it and lived in it. It was turned over during the first part of the time we had a Commissioner there. When we changed the office from that of Governor General to High Commissioner the palace was turned back to the Filipinos, and President Quezon took up residence in it. The Governor General went to live in some club and was criticized for it.

Now, the gentleman talks as though Governor Murphy is to blame for it. He has left the Philippines. There is

nothing at the bottom of this but cold politics, and the gentleman is bringing it out here and spreading it all over the House.

Mr. ENGEL. Politics nothing!

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 additional minutes.

Mr. Chairman, as far as politics is concerned, you can call it anything you want to; the fact remains that Governor Murphy is responsible for making 17 acres of land in Manila Bay where there was 38 feet of water and for the building of the sea wall. He selected it. The Secretary of War says so. Mr. McNutt says so. Mr. McNutt put the bee right on Murphy.

Mr. RABAUT and Mr. KITCHENS rose.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Chairman, I do not yield further.

I do not see how anybody here can justify the building of an 86-room palace covering an acre of ground. Of course, you on that side do not like it.

Mr. RABAUT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ENGEL. I do not yield any further. Of course, you do not like it. You cannot take it, and neither can Governor Murphy take it.

Mr. RABAUT. You are not stating it correctly.

Mr. ENGEL. If you can justify the building of a palace of that kind in this day and age with people going hungry, with 13,000,000 people unemployed, a palace larger than the White House, containing 86 rooms with a ballroom floor 40 by 65, with 825 feet of loggias and what not, I say you are a better Democrat than I think you are.

I want to discuss the second palace. I have referred to only one of them so far. That was just one palace. They are building another one up in the hills.

Now I want to tell you about this second palace. I do not know of anything you Democrats can say to justify this thing. I have already told you about the first palace and its land.

The second palace is 134 feet long and 64 feet wide, just a small one. It is only 36 feet shorter than the White House and about 24 feet narrower than the White House. It is a small place compared to the first palace. It only has 43 rooms, hallways, passageways, and so forth. It has a reception room 38 feet long and 25 feet wide. It has a dining room 21 feet by 29 feet. It has a kitchen, pantry, and powder room. As a matter of fact, they have a powder room in both of these palaces. You would think you were going to some ancient palace in Europe. This, however, is a face powder, not a gunpowder room. They have a sitting room 21 by 25 on the second floor. Here is one bedroom 31 by 19 and another one 21 by 12. Altogether they have 43 rooms in this second palace up in the hills.

Mr. KNUTSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ENGEL. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. KNUTSON. What is the seating capacity in this second palace?

Mr. ENGEL. The seating capacity is unknown.

Mr. HOUSTON. Will the gentleman yield for a brief observation?

Mr. ENGEL. The gentleman may take time on his side. I have been very liberal in yielding, and I want to finish.

The following gives a description of the rooms, and so forth, of the second palace, excluding rooms used for office space:

DESCRIPTION OF THE SUMMER PALACE IN THE MOUNTAINS AT BAGUIO

Dimensions are 134 feet long and 64 feet wide. White House dimensions are 170 feet long and 85 feet wide. The palace has 43 various rooms, hallways, passageways, including 10 toilets or bathrooms; seating capacity unknown.

First floor: Reception hall, 38 by 25 feet; dining room, 21 by 29 feet; kitchen, 16 by 21 feet; pantry, 8 by 21 feet; powder room, 10½ by 15 feet; library, 21 feet 6 inches by 25 feet; loggia, 6 by 63 feet; storage, 8 by 19 feet; hall, 8 by 25 feet; hall, 8 by 5½ feet; 3 bedrooms, 10 by 11.6 feet.

Second floor: sitting room, 21 by 25 feet; 3 bedrooms, 16 by 13 feet; 1 bedroom, 15 by 13 feet, 1 bedroom, 21 by 12.6 feet; dressing room, 8 by 10½ feet; bedroom, 31 by 19 feet; dressing room, 8 by 16 feet; bedroom, 21 by 12 feet; bedroom, 16 by 11.6 feet; hall, 11 by 19 feet; storage room, 25 by 16 feet; pantry, 7½ by 10½ feet (second floor); linen closet, 4½ by 9 feet; porch, 10 by 41 feet and 10 by 75 feet.

The cost of the summer palace is \$250,000.

May I say, in all seriousness, Governor Murphy was responsible for selecting the site; he was responsible for recommending it, according to both the War Department and the Secretary of War.

Mr. Chairman, it is an outrage and a shame to go out there and build these palaces in the Philippine Islands with the money of the taxpayers of this country. I repeat, it is an outrage and a shame in this day and age, when we are running behind billions of dollars. As a matter of fact, we should get out of the Philippine Islands. A statement was made in the paper with reference to the money we are asked to pay for rent over there. Mr. McNutt wants to pay \$15,000 a year rent for a palace. Let me tell you what he said about that palace when I tried to get some information. I am speaking now of the palace he wants to rent pending the construction of the new palace over there. He was asked, "How much is that per year?" Mr. McNutt said that \$15,000 a year is a reasonable rent over there. Mr. TERRY asked him, "How many rooms will it have?" Mr. McNutt, the High Commissioner of the Philippines, who wants us to pay \$15,000 rent, answered the question.

Did he tell us how many rooms? Did he say anything about the size? No. His answer was, "I have not seen the layout." Now, beat that if you can. He is asking this Congress to appropriate \$15,000 a year to pay rent for that palace that he wants to use pending the building of the new one, yet he has not seen it and cannot even tell us the number of rooms.

That palace that he wants us to rent is worth, so he says, 275,000 pesos, about \$138,000 American money. That would be giving them about 11 percent gross on their investment if the palace is worth the money Mr. McNutt says it is worth, which is a mighty good return on the investment.

Mr. MASSINGALE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ENGEL. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. MASSINGALE. I am very much interested in the gentleman's description of the palaces. I should like the gentleman to inform the House, if he can, inasmuch as he has stated that one of these palaces has 49 so-called "sit-downs" whether Chick Sale was one of the architects of the building.

Mr. ENGEL. I may say to the gentleman I do not believe that in view of the price the High Commissioner is asking us to pay as rent that he is going to use any Sears-Roebuck catalogs and it is not any "two and a half holer," according to Chick Sale's specifications.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein certain tables compiled by myself.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. POWERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CHURCH].

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Chairman, I think every Member of this House would consider it too preposterous to be true if I were simply to say that one of our bureaucratic Government officials has been deliberately endeavoring to promote, through his official position, the private interests of a lawyer engaged in private practice here in Washington. That was my reaction when I was advised a few days ago that a million or more letters had been sent out by the Home Owners' Loan Corporation to lawyers and individual citizens who made loans with the Corporation to impress them with the ability of a Washington attorney. I dismissed the story as mere rumor. I simply could not believe that anyone would be guilty of such unethical practice. It is a violation of the canons of legal ethics for any lawyer to advertise. It is certainly a violation of every rule of good government and common decency for any official to use his position to advertise the services of a member of the bar.

But, Mr. Chairman, I find that it was not rumor but a fact: Mr. Horace Russell, general counsel of the Home Owners' Loan Corporation, has sent out such letters adver-

tising the legal services of Judge O. B. Taylor, who recently resigned as associate general counsel of that Corporation. I have just received a number of these letters from persons to whom these "advertisements" were addressed.

Permit me to read this letter, several of which I hold here in my hand. I hope I may have your undivided attention in noting carefully the language of this letter:

HOME OWNERS' LOAN CORPORATION,
OFFICE OF HORACE RUSSELL, GENERAL COUNSEL,
Washington, April 11, 1938.

MY DEAR FRIEND: I wrote you many months ago of the resignation and return to private practice of Mr. W. T. Stockton, associate general counsel in charge of the Home Owners' Loan Corporation legal staff. It is with much regret that I must now announce the resignation of Judge O. B. Taylor, associate general counsel in charge, to engage in the private practice of the law in Washington, D. C. He will engage in practice before the bureaus, commissions, and Departments of the Government, as well as in the courts. We deeply regret losing one who has made such a major contribution to the success of our legal department.

Judge Taylor is a lawyer of great ability and a man of the utmost tact and possessed of a great capacity for accomplishment. Having participated in the direction of this staff these several years in Washington, he has gained an intimate knowledge of the United States Government, its Departments, agencies, and bureaus. As a result, his success in private practice in Washington is assured. I am sure that many of us will be interested to turn to him for assistance and advice in his capacity as a private lawyer.

It is encouraging, as responsible members of our staff resign for more lucrative private practice, to find them succeeding throughout the country. The Washington staff of Home Owners' Loan Corporation will function as heretofore under the three divisions, with three associate general counsel, and with the employees of Judge Taylor's office attached to my office.

Very truly yours,

HORACE RUSSELL, General Counsel.

P. S.—Judge Taylor's address is the Investment Building, Washington, D. C.

Mr. KITCHENS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?
Mr. CHURCH. I should like to finish my statement, if I may.

Mr. KITCHENS. I would like to know to whom that letter was addressed.

Mr. CHURCH. I will answer that in a moment. I have a number of these letters here.

You will note that this letter is written on the letterhead of the Home Owners' Loan Corporation from the "office of Horace Russell, general counsel," and that it bears the signature of "Horace Russell." Insofar as the appearance of the letter is concerned, it is an "official communication" from the United States Government.

Mr. SADOWSKI. Was it sent under the frank also?

Mr. CHURCH. Yes; with the notice regarding the penalty of \$300 printed on the envelope.

Mr. HOOK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CHURCH. I shall be pleased to yield a little later, in order that my remarks will have a continuity.

I call your special attention to the fact that great care is taken to emphasize the fact that Judge O. B. Taylor, formerly associate general counsel of the Home Owners' Loan Corporation, "will engage in practice before the bureaus, commissions, and Departments of the Government." It goes on to say, "Judge Taylor is a lawyer of great ability and a man of utmost tact and possessed of a great capacity for accomplishment."

Mr. Chairman, does that phrase "great capacity for accomplishment" mean to imply that he can, because of his previous associations, contacts, and friends, accomplish much more than some other attorney? Does not that language leave the impression with the party who receives the letter that it would be well for him to give his H. O. L. C. business to Judge Taylor? He has "great capacity for accomplishment." He has the "in," so to speak.

And, Mr. Chairman, listen to this sentence: "I am sure that many of us will be interested to turn to him for assistance and advice in his capacity as a private lawyer." Does that mean that the Corporation itself will have occasion to "turn to him for assistance and advice"? The letter states: "Many of us will be interested to turn to him." "Many of us," Mr. Chairman.

Not to be overlooked is the all-important postscript of this letter. It reads:

Judge Taylor's address is the Investment Building, Washington, D. C.

In other words, the reader is not only advised of Judge Taylor's previous services with the Corporation, he is not only advised of his "great capacity for accomplishment," but it was made certain that everyone knows where he can be contacted.

Considering the tone of this letter and the fact that it was written on official stationery, I do not think I would do any injustice to Judge Taylor and Mr. Russell if I were to say that it appears the firm of Taylor & Russell has been established with offices in the Investment Building and the Home Owners' Loan Corporation. It amounts to a public announcement to that effect. As to the manner of distribution of the partnership fees, I am not advised.

As scandalous and disgraceful as this letter is, in which the Home Owners' Loan Corporation solicits the legal business of millions of home owners and lawyers for an individual lawyer, I wish to point out that every one of these letters was sent out under the frank of the Corporation as official business. I have here in my hand a number of the envelopes. I call your attention to one of them. It shows:

Home Owners' Loan Corporation, Washington, D. C. Official business.

Penalty for private use to avoid payment of postage, \$300.

Mr. Allen Gurney Mills, attorney at law, 53 West Jackson Boulevard, Chicago, Ill.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CHURCH. Briefly.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I am very much interested in what the gentleman from Illinois is saying because I, too, this morning received through the mails from a constituent the identical letter to which the gentleman is referring, which my constituent states came to him as Government printed matter and as franked mail. My constituent went on to state that he was enclosing the envelope in which the communication came to him, whereon is printed "Penalty for private use to avoid payment of postage, \$300." He stated that it seemed to him very much like private use, and suggested that, perhaps, Mr. Russell might like to pay \$300 to the Government for the private use he has made of the mails.

Mr. CHURCH. I may say to the gentleman from Massachusetts that that is the same letter of which I am speaking. Many Members of the House have today called my attention to the fact that in Michigan, Massachusetts, and many other States people have received this letter from Horace Russell dated April 11. In Chicago they were receiving it on the 13th and 14th, as these postmarked envelopes indicate.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CHURCH. I will yield in just a minute.

Think of it, Mr. Chairman, a letter of this kind being sent out by one of our officials as official business, with the postage being paid for by the taxpayers. The taxpayers paid for the paper, and no doubt they paid for the printing and addressing, and they paid the postage for this advertisement. Doubtless millions of these letters were sent out all over the United States. It is clearly a violation of the franking law, for each violation of which there is a penalty of \$300. It thus becomes the duty of the Postmaster General and the Attorney General to prosecute for each and every violation. It becomes their duty to collect the penalty for each of the millions of letters distributed.

Permit me to read to you just a few extracts from one of the letters from a party who received one of these communications. His statement is merely a sample of the reaction of the attorneys and others who received this "official advertisement":

I think this is one of the most disgraceful and unjustifiable efforts on the part of a representative of the administration to promote the private interests of an individual at the taxpayer's

expense. The letter also seems to me to be a flagrant violation of one of the canons of the American Bar Association covering the unethical practice of advertising by members of the bar.

It makes a taxpayer's blood boil to receive letters of this kind, which the taxpayer himself must pay for.

Mr. Chairman, my constituent is correct. This is disgraceful. It is scandalous. It is bureaucracy at its worst. It is nothing more than using the Government for private gain. It violates our laws and it violates the ethics of the legal profession. It is personal advertisement at the taxpayer's expense. It is a disgraceful personal advertisement at the expense of the millions of poor H. O. L. C. applicants who are losing their homes. I cannot tolerate this practice.

Mr. Chairman, a congressional investigation is unnecessary. We have the facts. I call for the dismissal of Mr. Horace Russell immediately, and I call upon the Postmaster General and Attorney General to prosecute immediately for the violations of our postal laws. It is the duty of Congress to stop these vicious bureaucratic practices. This is merely one of them.

It is the duty of every Member of this Congress to call this sort of thing to the attention of the Attorney General and to the public, in order that the pressure of public opinion may bring an end to such practices as this.

I am told that Mr. Horace Russell is president of the Federal Bar Association. This is indeed a peculiar situation where the head of an association which should advance legal ethics himself engages in an unethical practice such as this.

Now I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOOK. I agree with the gentleman that this thing is absolutely wrong. I should like to call the attention of the gentleman to the fact that the Chairman of the Home Owners' Loan Corporation should be responsible and should look after such things. The Chairman of the Home Owners' Loan Corporation was one of the campaign managers for Hoover when he ran for President. I am just wondering whether some of the Republican chicanery has gone down into that organization.

Mr. CHURCH. This is not a political matter, and I do not wish to discuss politics. But I want to say to the gentleman that if he uses that argument to justify this thing, it is indeed a poor one.

Mr. HOOK. It is my thought that if we Democrats were at the head of such organizations we would not have such conditions.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CHURCH. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. MICHENER. May I suggest for the benefit of my colleague from Michigan [Mr. Hook] that conditions similar to those complained of by the gentleman from Illinois were so bad after the World War that the Congress passed an act, which is the law today, making it unlawful for any person connected with the Government to engage in practice before the Departments or against the Government until the expiration of 2 years after they had severed their connections with the Government. If what the gentleman from Illinois has stated is happening, it must be because the Home Owners' Loan Corporation is a Federal corporation and not a bureau, so that this may be done without violating the particular statute to which I have referred. As I understand it, Colonel Taylor was an attorney in Home Owners' Loan Corporation and should be limited by the 2-year provision of this law.

In 1921 it was a common thing for those leaving the Government—and I am not talking about politics, because some of the best men in the country were included, and some of them are here today—to send out letters that they had been connected with the Government, that they knew about particular contracts, that they were in a better position to effect settlements with the Government than one not connected with the Government, and in this manner solicited business.

There are printed hearings in which this is all a matter of record. If Mr. Fahey was appointed by Mr. Hoover, and

if Mr. Roosevelt has retained him as Chairman of the Board, that has nothing to do with the complaint of the gentleman from Illinois about the conduct of Mr. Russell. If the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Hook] could find it possible to consider the facts and forget that he is a partisan new dealer for a minute, he might appreciate such reprehensible conduct on the part of any representative of the Government or any of its agencies.

Mr. CHURCH. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CHURCH. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. SADOWSKI. I just want to say that I agree with the gentleman 100 percent, and as a Democrat I want to join with the gentleman in protesting this kind of action on the part of any Government official. They have no right to do this, and it is absolutely wrong; and whether it is a Democratic or a Republican administration it should not be tolerated.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Chairman, there is no secret about the number of letters that have come to me. I have a few of them here, and I hope that the lawyers and the applicants for H. O. L. C. loans all over the United States will not be afraid to advise us so that we may know exactly as to the number of letters that have been distributed.

Here is one of these envelopes. I have one here addressed to G. E. Dierson, attorney at law, room 612, South Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill. I quoted this one from Mr. Mills in my first statement. I have another one from Mr. Stanley G. Armstrong, attorney at law, 201 North Wells Street, Chicago, Ill., and another one addressed to Mr. James M. Gillespie, attorney at law, 29 South LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill. I could quote from a number of others, but I do not have them here handy. I call upon the Attorney General and call upon the Postmaster General to go into this matter. We must stop this vicious conduct, as well as the growth of bureaucracy in which it thrives. This is just one small illustration of what is going on.

Mr. HAINES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CHURCH. Yes; I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. HAINES. I want to compliment the gentleman for bringing this to the attention of the House. I think the gentleman is doing the country a good service in bringing it to our attention. Did the gentleman say there were about 1,000,000 of these letters sent out?

Mr. CHURCH. I was informed just the other day to that effect. I did not believe it. Was the gentleman on the floor when I started my statement?

Mr. HAINES. Yes.

Mr. CHURCH. I did not believe it—I could not believe it. I passed it off and forgot about it, but then these letters were received by me, as I have explained, and then I believed it.

Mr. HAINES. Did these letters go only to lawyers?

Mr. CHURCH. Those I have here went to lawyers, but I understand that other letters were received by H. O. L. C. applicants. I have been informed that there are a number of persons who do not want to disclose the fact that they received these letters. I understand that lawyers and applicants for H. O. L. C. loans from all over the United States have received these letters. I believe that my informant was correct in stating that over 1,000,000 of these letters were sent out soliciting business for Judge Taylor.

Mr. HAINES. Does the gentleman infer from that letter that the gentleman who has just left the Department, Judge Taylor, could be of assistance in obtaining relief on the part of distressed home owners?

Mr. CHURCH. The best way I can answer the gentleman from Pennsylvania is to say that Mr. Russell emphasizes in his letter that Judge Taylor is a lawyer of great ability and a man of the utmost tact.

You know tact is a very valuable thing around the Government bureaus. The letter further says that he is possessed of great capacity for accomplishment, and another paragraph says that the Washington staff of the Home Owners' Loan

Corporation will function as heretofore under the three divisions of the three associate general counsel, with the employees of Judge Taylor's office attached to "my office." Moreover, the letter says that Judge Taylor has gained an intimate knowledge of the United States Government. You draw your own conclusions.

Mr. HAINES. The gentleman himself is a distinguished lawyer, and I am just wondering how much the gentleman would pay for that sort of an advertisement going out through the Nation.

Mr. CHURCH. I want in my humble way to show what the members of the bar in my State where I practice think of this kind of activity by a Government official.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CHURCH. Yes; I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Just to keep the record straight, it is my impression that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Hook] is in error. The present Chairman of the H. O. L. C. Board, Mr. Fahey, a distinguished citizen of Massachusetts, so far as I know, has been a lifelong Democrat.

Mr. BACON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CHURCH. Yes; I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. BACON. Do I understand that this law firm has been advertised under Government frank?

Mr. CHURCH. I show the gentleman these franked envelopes, one of which I am placing in the RECORD. On the envelope is notice to the user that he is liable to a \$300 penalty for every one of these envelopes that he places in the mail for a private purpose—and advertising the private practice of Judge Taylor is a private purpose.

Mr. BACON. The frank itself says that for private use to avoid the payment of postage there is a fine of \$300. It seems to me that the gentleman ought to bring these facts to the attention of the Attorney General; because if the Attorney General does his duty, he will prosecute this case.

Mr. CHURCH. I have been requested by a number of Members to make this statement and to send these records to the Attorney General and to the Postmaster General. I am glad to be assured of the cooperation of those on the Democratic side in this matter. I shall endeavor to see that this is not only stopped but that all parties guilty of such conduct are prosecuted.

If there are no more questions, I shall ask leave to include in my remarks some of the letters I have received. They show how our people react to this kind of action.

DEAR RALPH: This letter prepared and sent at Government expense doesn't just sit right with me. How about you?
Regards.

SID STEIN.

CHICAGO, April 16, 1938.

HON. RALPH E. CHURCH,

House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. CHURCH: I have, this morning, received and am enclosing herewith a letter, dated April 11, 1938, from Horace Russell, of Washington, D. C., general counsel for the Home Owners' Loan Corporation. I am also enclosing the envelope in which the letter was received, which shows the letter was sent out as an official communication without postage and at the expense of the taxpayer. The printing bill was also incurred at the expense of the taxpayer.

I think this is one of the most disgraceful and unjustifiable efforts on the part of a representative of the administration to promote the private interests of an individual at the taxpayer's expense. The letter also seems to me to be a flagrant violation of one of the canons of the American Bar Association covering the unethical practice of advertising by members of the bar.

It makes a taxpayer's blood boil to receive letters of this kind which the taxpayer himself must pay for. No doubt there are many other similar flagrant violations of conduct comporting with the rules of common decency, and the number of such violations may have been so great that the conscience of the representatives of the people in Congress may have become seared.

My residence is 790 Sheridan Road, Glenview, Ill., which is in your district.

Yours very truly,

ALLEN G. MILLS.

P. S.—I presume the enclosed letter has been sent out to the members of the bar throughout the country.

CHICAGO, April 16, 1938.

HON. RALPH E. CHURCH,

House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR RALPH: This morning I received the letter which I am enclosing in the envelope in which it came, which I take to be an announcement of the return to private practice of one of the employees of the H. O. L. C.

I thought you might be interested in knowing that they are evidently using Government mails under their frank for the purpose of making private announcements.

I congratulate you on your renomination and assure you that I shall do everything that I can between now and November to return you to the post, the duties of which you have so ably performed.

Yours very truly,

JAMES M. GILLESPIE.

CHICAGO, April 16, 1938.

HON. RALPH E. CHURCH,

House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR RALPH: It seems hardly necessary to congratulate you on your victory of last Tuesday, as we well knew that the people of our district fully appreciate the splendid work you are doing, and thus the vote you received is wholly a vote of confidence. We rejoice that our people rightfully have that confidence in you. We are sure that we will now go on to a glorious victory in November.

Now, Ralph, while considering ways and means of raising funds to conduct our Government, may we suggest that you devise a way of compelling Mr. Horace Russell and Judge O. B. Taylor to pay the penalty provided for the use of the franking privilege to avoid the payment of postage.

As proof, we are enclosing a letter received this morning from Mr. Russell in a franked envelope, and being nothing but an advertisement for business for Judge Taylor.

If this letter has gone to all the members of the bar in the country, the penalty should just about pay off the national debt.

Yours truly,

STANLEY C. ARMSTRONG.

Mr. TERRY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COCHRAN].

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman from Missouri 5 minutes.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Chairman, as chairman of the Committee on Expenditures, I have repeatedly stated on the floor of the House that the committee would welcome any evidence where any Member of the House or any individual could show that Government officials were not conducting themselves properly. Further, that whenever that evidence was presented the committee would be glad to make an investigation if the facts warranted it.

It so happens the Committee on Expenditures in this particular instance is just a few days ahead of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CHURCH]. I do not think there is a Member of the House who condones the offense. I for one do not, and as chairman of that committee I have already taken this matter up with the Chairman of the Home Owners' Loan Corporation and my communication to him was not sent to the office of the Home Owners' Loan Corporation but sent to his hotel, so that I would be sure he would receive it. I sent him a copy of a letter similar to the one that the gentleman has just read, and I am going to get an answer from the Chairman of the Home Owners' Loan Corporation and if that answer is not satisfactory I can assure the Members of the House that the official of the Home Owners' Loan Corporation responsible for the sending out of the letters will be called before the Committee on Expenditures, and we will get the information then. I think I speak for every member of the Committee on Expenditures, in the expression of my views, and I am also quite sure that there is not a Member of the House who does not agree with me, that no one will condone this offense, a direct violation of the franking privilege. It should be stopped and will be stopped.

The one responsible should be punished for it.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COCHRAN. Yes.

Mr. CHURCH. I regard the gentleman who has just spoken as one of the most able and valuable Members of the House, and I am glad that he has made the statement that he has. This is not a partisan matter in any way, and I am glad to stand aside and give the gentleman the opportunity to develop this situation. I am sorry that I did not know he had taken the matter up. I am glad, however,

to have learned that both sides of this House are interested in cleaning up this thing which should be cleaned up.

Mr. COCHRAN. I asked the gentleman from Illinois to yield to me during the course of his speech, but he would not yield. I, therefore, requested this time to make the statement I have made.

Mr. CHURCH. When I finished I asked if there were any other questions.

Mr. COCHRAN. Under permission to revise my remarks let me state for the RECORD when I returned to my office I found a message from Mr. Fahey, chairman of the Home Owners' Loan Corporation. It had been there for some time and I immediately called him. He told me that Mr. Russell, who had sent out the letters, was resigning immediately. Mr. Fahey stated he deeply regretted the sending out of the letters and could not understand why they had been mailed, other than out of friendship and in appreciation of the loyalty of the men who had left the service.

Mr. TERRY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. RABAUT].

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, in answer to my colleague from Michigan [Mr. ENGEL], who spoke a few moments ago regarding the proposed building activities at Manila, I wish to say that this House did not originate the idea of building the palace in Manila. That was put in the deficiency bill of 1935 in the Senate; but for the purpose of clearing the atmosphere on what went on here this afternoon I want to call attention to the hearings on the War Department civil functions appropriation bill that is now pending before the House. I read the following from page 52:

Mr. ENGEL. Will you kindly tell us just what it is proposed to do or is being done in the way of providing a residence for the High Commissioner in the Philippine Islands?

Mr. McNUTT. Plans and specifications have been drawn and bids have been asked for for the quarters and offices in Manila.

Mr. ENGEL. That is for the High Commissioner's residence?

This is not simply for the palace; it is going to be for offices, too.

Mr. McNUTT. That, of course, is a combination residence and office.

Mr. ENGEL. All in one building?

Mr. McNUTT. That is right. If the contract is made in the latter part of next month, it is estimated that it will be not less than 18 months before the house is ready for occupancy.

Mr. ENGEL. At a total cost of how much?

Mr. McNUTT. For the construction both at Manila and Baguio the amount is \$750,000.

Mr. ENGEL. How much for each?

Mr. McNUTT. The division, as I remember it, is \$522,000 for Manila and \$151,900 for Baguio, and there is a reserve of the amount of the balance.

Mr. ENGEL. One house is for the summer residence and the other one for the winter residence?

Mr. McNUTT. We begin the hot season about now, and it gets hotter and hotter until the end of June. The first time I stopped at Manila was the 26th of April, and it felt as if you were going through hot soup. Everybody goes to Baguio at that time.

Mr. ENGEL. It is cooler there?

Mr. McNUTT. It is cooler, and that is one of the most delightful spots in the world. It is the marvel of the Tropics. You have to have a fire every night, and you sleep under blankets. You cannot believe you are in the Tropics.

Mr. ENGEL. What proportion of this total amount is devoted to the office and what percentage to the residence, at each place, approximately?

This is where you get the facts and discount some of the ravings.

Mr. McNUTT. I would say it is about 60 percent for the office and 40 percent for the residence in Manila, and about 75 percent for the residence and 25 percent for the office in Baguio.

Mr. ENGEL. It is all one building?

Mr. McNUTT. Yes; it is all one building in both places.

Mr. ENGEL. Not a group of buildings?

Mr. McNUTT. No; it is one building in each place.

We can never move the passport office from Manila, but when we go to Baguio we take a part of the staff up there to work. But a part of the staff always remains in Manila.

Mr. ENGEL. Baguio is up in the mountains?

Mr. McNUTT. Yes; approximately 160 miles from Manila.

Mr. ENGEL. Where you get away from the heat?

Mr. McNUTT. Yes. The Army makes an allowance of a month to every officer on duty out there so that they can go to Baguio, to Camp Hay during that time.

It is one thing that makes it possible for people who have grown up in this country to live out there.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield right there?

Mr. RABAUT. Just a moment. I will not yield now. We talk about this made land out in Manila Bay. This created land is a 17-acre tract that has been created in the bay. According to the statement, it cost \$75,000 for 17 acres; the acre cost \$4,000. Incidentally, it is the most choice piece of property perhaps in Manila. I saw the property. I would say that it is a good investment. It is next door to the Army and Navy Club. To believe that ground in that vicinity could be acquired at \$4,000 an acre would stretch the imagination even of the gentleman from Michigan to imagine where similar land could be bought in a metropolitan area for \$4,000 an acre.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RABAUT. I shall be happy to yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. ENGEL. Could the gentleman justify paying \$4,000 an acre for ground when the Government already owned ground to put the palace on, according to McNutt's testimony?

Mr. RABAUT. The Malacañan Palace was next door to a brewery. I do not suppose the gentleman knows that.

Mr. ENGEL. Does the gentleman think the expense of creating this site justified when other equally desirable sites were available on land the Government owned?

Mr. RABAUT. If the gentleman will search the record he will find that this site was approved by both the Army and the Navy engineers.

Mr. ENGEL. On recommendation of Governor Murphy.

Mr. RABAUT. I suppose Governor Murphy, acting as High Commissioner of the islands, had the right to approve something the Army or Navy did.

Mr. ENGEL. Yes; but taking it out of the public's purse.

Mr. RABAUT. That is an unfair statement.

Mr. KITCHENS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ENGEL. I yield.

Mr. KITCHENS. The great River Pasig runs through the city of Manila and empties into Manila Bay. The old city of Manila had a high wall around it and water moats around it filled with cholera germs and disease germs of every kind. The Americans went in there, cleaned that up, filled those moats, and made land out of it.

Mr. RABAUT. They play golf there today.

Mr. KITCHENS. It is the finest place for a Government building that there is in the Philippine Islands.

Mr. RABAUT. The wall is still there.

Mr. KITCHENS. Part of the wall.

Mr. RABAUT. Part of the wall is still there.

Mr. ENGEL. Does the gentleman think we ought to spend \$750,000 in this day and age with the condition of the times to build two palaces out there for the High Commissioner of the Philippines to live in?

Mr. RABAUT. I ask the gentleman to state where he gets the \$750,000 for a palace. There is nothing to that but a red herring.

Mr. ENGEL. The site was approved by and the project undertaken upon the recommendation of Mr. Murphy.

Mr. RABAUT. That is nothing but drawing a red herring across the trail.

Mr. ENGEL. Drawing a red herring across the trail at a cost to the people of the country of three-quarters of a million dollars.

Mr. TERRY. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. RABAUT] 3 additional minutes.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, may I say to my friend from Michigan that I do not blame those on the minority side. In fact, it is their particular function to find fault with those on the majority side of the House. However, I hardly think it is the proper thing to come here and dig up something that happened over in the Senate and then heap all of that upon the head of some man who was Commissioner at that time, whose particular function it was to O. K. certain things that were presented to him in his official capacity.

I do not think it is quite fair to bring it up here today after that individual has left office. He has left Manila and is now Governor of Michigan, the State from which the gentleman comes.

Mr. ENGEL. Gone but not forgotten.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, he is going to come up this year for election, so it is now time to get out the brickbats and what-have-you, throw them around so that they may resound from the Halls of the national body here, permeate throughout the Nation and have their echo in Michigan to find comfort with a few who happen to hold the same views as does the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. ENGEL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RABAUT. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. ENGEL. Does the gentleman think that I, being a Member of Congress, should remain silent about those wonderful palaces they are building, which palaces contain among other things a dance hall 40 by 65 and all these rooms, and say nothing about it because I am a Republican and Governor Murphy is a Democrat?

Mr. RABAUT. I heard some gentlemen on that side quiz the gentleman and enter into the argument for the sole purpose of egging on the situation. I also saw those same gentlemen gracefully glide across those very floors in the Malacañan Palace to the tune of three or four orchestras.

Mr. ENGEL. The gentleman did not see me do that.

Mr. RABAUT. And they are just as subject to this glow of the tuned life as anybody who sits on the Democratic side.

Mr. ENGEL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RABAUT. Surely.

Mr. ENGEL. The gentleman glided across the floors but I did not.

Mr. RABAUT. The gentleman from Michigan was not there.

Mr. ENGEL. Indeed, I was not there.

Mr. RABAUT. But I was there.

Mr. ENGEL. Why did the gentleman not tell us, then, about these palaces?

Mr. RABAUT. I never saw those palaces. I told the gentleman about the old palace. I told him also that it never belonged to the United States.

Mr. ENGEL. I am interested in the new palaces. Why did the gentleman not tell us? He was there and saw this going on. Why was he so silent? Why did he not tell us about this 86-room palace?

Mr. RABAUT. The gentleman is entirely wrong. These two palaces are only a piece of paper. They do not even exist.

Mr. ENGEL. I have the plans right here.

Mr. RABAUT. The gentleman knows about the 40 sit-downs, and all that, and he is getting quite nervous.

Mr. ENGEL. I have the plans.

Mr. RABAUT. At any rate, the gentleman is a good fellow.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. TERRY. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. RABAUT] 5 additional minutes.

Mr. ENGEL. We will call it the McNutt-Murphy palace.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, a great deal has been said here, some serious and some otherwise, concerning the proposed palaces or the proposed new residences to be erected in the Philippine Islands. The gentleman from Michigan knows just as well as I do or any other Member of this body that all over the world there are embassies of the different governments, many of them being here in Washington, of the sister governments on the various continents of the world. It is only natural, we having been the guardian of the Philippines, for this country to have established herself, as it were, in a remembering mode or fashion in the establishment of a residence for the High Commissioner and later for the Embassy at Manila. When we hear of the necessity, resulting from the temperature of the place, for the erection of a palace at Baguio, it is readily to be recognized by anyone. As I read from the hearings, the members of the Army go to Baguio for a month each year under official orders. It seems that relief is necessary from the heat which exists over there.

Mr. Chairman, it is very easy to find fault. Someone has rightfully said that anyone can be a wrecker, but it takes a great deal to be a constructionist. I dislike very much to stand up here in the House and enter into an argument, especially with a Member from my own State; but after all is said and done, the highest office in a State is the office of Governor. When the Governor of a State, an honest and respected individual, is being blamed for something which, to my way of thinking, was simply an official act on his part, and when it is sought to make it a personal blame, laying it on in a special manner, then I regard it my duty to rise in defense of his position. For this purpose and this reason alone I entered into the argument this afternoon on the floor concerning the activities with reference to the building of these edifices at Manila. [Applause.]

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I am very frank to say that I have not had the opportunity that the gentleman from Michigan, who just spoke, has had of visiting the Philippine Islands at the expense of somebody—I do not know whom—and gliding over the floors under a tropical moon, dancing the light fantastic with fair, dusky señoritas.

Mr. Chairman, I did not have the opportunity of seeing that wonderful 17 acres with 38 feet of water, that 17 acres of land with a sea wall which cost us \$75,000. I did not know anything about this palace. If I had known about it at the time the gentleman from Michigan did I certainly should have been on the floor to make a protest.

The gentleman speaks about being a constructionist. I agree with the gentleman that the Democratic Party, Mr. Murphy, the War Department, and the State Department are constructionists to the extent of spending \$500,000 for this 86-room palace in Manila and \$250,000 worth of palace up in the hills at Baguio. I do not object to erecting a fine building and I do not object to the High Commissioner's going up into the hills where it is cool, but I do object in this day and age when the conditions are as they are to spending that amount of money for a palace which is 33 feet longer and 49 feet wider than the White House. I say it is an outrage, and I do not care whether it is a Democrat or a Republican who is responsible.

The gentleman says I am blaming Mr. Murphy. Mr. McNutt testified his predecessor was responsible. Mr. Burnett, of the War Department, whose statement I read into the RECORD, stated it was upon the recommendation of Mr. Murphy that this site was chosen. So it is members of the Democratic Party who are making that statement, and I am quoting them. If it is a crime to quote them, then I am guilty of a crime.

Mr. Chairman, I believe the time has come when we must eliminate every bit of waste from the Government. I think this is the most extravagant, sinful, and outrageous piece of waste of the people's money that has taken place in the history of this country. It may be only \$750,000 or \$1,000,000. It may be what a Member on the other side of the aisle called "only chicken feed," but it is hard cash and comes out of the taxpayers' pockets. You can talk all you want to and draw your red herring across the path and talk politics, but the fact remains, Mr. Chairman, that the palace is being built by the Democratic Party, that Murphy recommended it, that it is larger than the White House, and you have another one up in the hills at Baguio which is costing somewhere near a million dollars.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. TERRY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. KITCHENS].

Mr. KITCHENS. Mr. Chairman, I have read the bill now before the Committee, and find nothing in it about an appropriation of \$750,000 or even \$50 for the building of any palaces in the Philippine Islands or anywhere else.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KITCHENS. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. McNutt testified it would cost \$750,000.

Mr. KITCHENS. Mr. McNutt has not testified about the bill now before the Committee, as far as I know. I am speaking about an appropriation in this bill for buildings in the Philippine Islands. There is no such thing in this bill.

I understand that 2 or 3 years ago the Senate put that provision in a bill, it was passed, and it has almost been forgotten. Of course, if we want to go back into other years we can talk of the \$44,000,000 Commerce Building in the city of Washington built at the instance of Mr. Hoover.

As far as the location of any building of the Government of the United States is concerned, since the city of Manila was built on low ground, since there was and is a great river coming down out of the mountains and running right through the city of Manila into Manila Bay, since this ground was low and there were old moats around the walls, and since this was a city of disease, full of the germs of cholera, bubonic plague, and other diseases, with the rubbish of the ages, the United States Government, its Army, and the Filipinos cleaned up this site, filled up all the moats, tore down part of the old wall, and filled in part of Manila Bay, thus giving the city of Manila more and higher ground. While I do not know anything about the value of the buildings or what would be necessary to construct proper and adequate buildings for the United States High Commissioner in the Philippine Islands, I submit I do know there is no more beautiful and no better site on which to place a building for an American official than the place that has been indicated here this afternoon. However, I understand that has nothing to do with the bill before us. I understand they are already putting up the building and that these 17 acres were filled in years ago. I was there 29 years ago when they were filling up a part of the Bay of Manila. They filled more than 100 acres.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a correction?

Mr. KITCHENS. Yes; I yield.

Mr. ENGEL. The work on the 17 acres they are filling in for the palace is just being completed now. The appropriation was made only 2 years ago.

Mr. KITCHENS. Very well; I think it would be a great thing if they would fill in a great deal more of the bay for the city of Manila if they would do as good a job as we did when I was there 29 years ago, because they have made a most beautiful city of Manila. The Americans did it, and they established a precedent there for the Filipinos which they will appreciate as long as there is a Commonwealth in the Philippine Islands. As I have said, I do not know anything about the cost of the building, but I understand from the gentleman from Michigan they were just going to build a palace there for the Commissioner to live in, but it results from the statement of the other gentleman from Michigan that the building will include all the offices; in fact, 60 percent of the building will be for Government offices, and was provided for over 2 years ago.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KITCHENS. I yield.

Mr. ENGEL. The rooms I gave excluded the space used for offices.

Mr. KITCHENS. Well, the impression I had from the gentleman's statement was that he was referring only to the Commissioner's residence.

Mr. ENGEL. The rooms I refer to are the living quarters and the rooms used by the Commissioner, and I excluded the office space.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. TERRY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Hook].

Mr. HOOK. Mr. Chairman, I was rather surprised at some of the statements made here this afternoon. In my opinion, some cheap politics is being played. You know in the State of Michigan we have a Governor who is absolutely honest, and there has never been anybody able to challenge the honesty of that man. He has given us an administration in Michigan that has been relieved of dishonesty. I do not know what these castles in the air amount to. I do know that there

are many blueprints that never do come into existence, and I do know that when a party cannot attack the integrity of the opposing party's leader they must be able to go out somewhere and pick some castles out of the air.

The Republican Party in Michigan has no issue. They cannot condemn Governor Murphy's administration because he has given us not only an efficient administration but he has given us an economical administration. Together with being a great humanitarian, not only in the State of Michigan—

Mr. SHAFER of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOOK. Not right now.

His record from the time he sat on the bench in the State of Michigan has been a record of greater things each day of his life. He was chosen from the State of Michigan and sent to the Philippine Islands, and his record as a humanitarian resounded throughout the world, and he was acclaimed by the residents of the Philippine Islands, and he was acclaimed by the people of the United States as one of the greatest officials that ever ruled over those islands. So much so that when he was receiving a salary of \$18,000 he resigned that post to come back to the State of Michigan and be elected Governor of that State at the meager salary of \$5,000, and he did this because of the fact that Michigan needed a real Democrat and needed democracy to clean up some of the things that were a stench in the nostrils of the public when we look back on some of the Republican administrations, and I do not believe the gentleman who is picking the castles out of the air and would try to have some sort of issue against Governor Murphy would even defend the Republican administration that preceded Murphy's. They will not defend it themselves, and this is all the more reason that we were happy to know that Governor Murphy stands as a man of high repute in the State of Michigan, not only by Democrats but by Republicans as well, and the honest and leading Republicans of the State of Michigan do respect Governor Murphy for his honesty, his integrity, and his ability as a man. We are proud of him. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. TERRY. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. DOXEY, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 10291) making appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1939, for civil functions administered by the War Department, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. FADDIS, for 4 days, on account of important business.

RIVER AND HARBOR BILL

Mr. MANSFIELD, by direction of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, reported the bill H. R. 10298 (Rept. No. 2162) authorizing the construction and repair and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors, and for other purposes, which was read a first and second time and, with the accompanying report, referred to the Union Calendar and ordered printed.

NAVY DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATION BILL, 1939—CONFERENCE REPORT AND STATEMENT

Mr. UMSTEAD. Mr. Speaker, I submit a conference report and statement upon the bill (H. R. 8993) making appropriations for the Navy Department and for the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1939, and for other purposes, for printing under the rule.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by printing a letter from a constituent, Mr. Booth Tarkington, on legislative topics.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, in connection with the extension of my remarks this afternoon I ask unanimous consent to include four short letters referred to in those remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend the remarks that I made on the agricultural bill and to include therein brief excerpts from the report of the Works Progress Administration.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

SENATE BILL REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and under the rule referred as follows:

S. 3684. An act to provide for the holding of terms of the District Courts of the United States for West Virginia at Fairmont and Beckley; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The Speaker announced his signature to enrolled bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 1279. An act to authorize the sale, under the provisions of the act of March 12, 1926 (44 Stat. 203), of surplus War Department real property;

S. 2531. An act to authorize the transfer of certain military reservations to other agencies of the Government and to the people of Puerto Rico, and for other purposes;

S. 3160. An act to provide for the exchange of land in the Territory of Alaska;

S. 3272. An act to clarify the status of pay and allowances under the provisions of the act of September 3, 1919; and

S. 3530. An act to amend the National Defense Act of June 3, 1916, as amended, by reestablishing the Regular Army Reserve, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. TERRY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 15 minutes p. m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, April 20, 1938, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

There will be a hearing before subcommittee No. 1 of the Committee on the Judiciary at 10:30 a. m. Wednesday, April 20, 1938, in room 346, House Office Building, for the consideration of H. R. 9745, to provide for guaranties of collective bargaining in contracts entered into and in the grant or loans of funds by the United States, or any agency thereof, and for other purposes.

COMMITTEE ON IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION

There will be a meeting of the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization in room 445, House Office Building, Thursday, April 21, 1938, at 10:30 a. m., for the consideration of unfinished business, private bills.

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

There will be a meeting of Mr. Eicher's subcommittee of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, at 10 a. m., Monday, April 25, 1938. Business to be considered: Hearing on H. R. 10292, trust indentures.

COMMITTEE ON THE LIBRARY

The Committee on the Library will hold hearings at 10:30 a. m., on Thursday, April 21, 1938, in room 1536, New House Office Building, on the following bills: H. R. 10217, House Joint Resolution 656, House Joint Resolution 631, House Joint Resolution 620, and House Joint Resolution 647.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1242. A letter from the Comptroller of the Currency, transmitting a copy of the Annual Report of the Comptroller

of the Currency for the year ended October 31, 1937; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

1243. A letter from the president, Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia, transmitting a proposed bill to provide for appointment of research assistants in the public schools of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1244. A letter from the president, Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia, transmitting a proposed bill entitled "A bill to provide for an additional judge for the police court of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1245. A letter from the Acting Secretary, Department of the Interior, transmitting the copy of a bill to amend the Alaska Railroad Retirement Act, approved June 29, 1936 (49 Stat. 2017); to the Committee on the Civil Service.

1246. A letter from the Acting Secretary, Department of the Treasury, transmitting the draft of a proposed bill to authorize the transfer to the jurisdiction of the Secretary of the Treasury of portions of the property within the military reservation known as the Morehead City Target Range, N. C., for the construction of improvements thereon, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

1247. A letter from The National Archives, transmitting a list of papers consisting of 1,260 items among the archives and records of the Department of the Treasury which the Department has recommended should be destroyed or otherwise disposed of; to the Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers.

1248. A letter from The National Archives, transmitting a list of papers consisting of 50 items among the archives and records of the Works Progress Administration which the Administration has recommended should be destroyed or otherwise disposed of; to the Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers.

1249. A letter from The National Archives, transmitting a list of papers consisting of 292 items among the archives and records of the Department of the Interior which the Department has recommended should be destroyed or otherwise disposed of; to the Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers.

1250. A letter from The National Archives, transmitting a list of papers consisting of 105 items among the archives of the Post Office Department which the Department has recommended should be destroyed or otherwise disposed of; to the Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers.

1251. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting three supplemental estimates of appropriation for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1939, for the Department of the Interior, amounting to \$8,750,000 (H. Doc. No. 602); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII,

Mr. ROGERS of Oklahoma: Committee on Indian Affairs. H. R. 7271. A bill authorizing the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Oklahoma to hear and determine certain claims of the Seminole Nation or Tribe of Indians; with amendment (Rept. No. 2155). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. HEALEY: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 6656. A bill making the 11th day of November in each year a legal holiday; without amendment (Rept. No. 2156). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. PHILLIPS: Committee on Naval Affairs. H. R. 9611. A bill to permit sales of surplus scrap materials of the Navy to certain institutions of learning; without amendment (Rept. No. 2157). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. PHILLIPS: Committee on Naval Affairs. H. R. 9801. A bill to provide for the retirement, rank, and pay of Chiefs

of Naval Operations, Chiefs of Bureau of the Navy Department, the Judge Advocates General of the Navy, and the Major Generals Commandant of the Marine Corps; without amendment (Rept. No. 2158). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. MAY: Committee on Military Affairs. S. 3459. An act to authorize the Secretary of War to acquire by donation land at or near Fort Missoula, Mont., for target range, military, or other public purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 2159). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. ANDREWS: Committee on Military Affairs. H. R. 9123. A bill to authorize the Secretary of War to lease to the village of Youngstown, N. Y., a portion of the Fort Niagara Military Reservation, N. Y.; with amendment (Rept. No. 2160). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 8148. A bill to amend Public Law No. 692, Seventy-fourth Congress, second session; with amendment (Rept. No. 2161). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. MANSFIELD: Committee on Rivers and Harbors. H. R. 10298. A bill authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 2162). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BOYKIN: A bill (H. R. 10306) to confer jurisdiction on the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and enter judgment upon the claims of Government contractors whose costs of performance were increased as a result of the National Industrial Recovery Act, June 16, 1933; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DOCKWEILER: A bill (H. R. 10307) to amend paragraph (k) of section 303 and paragraph (b) of section 319 of the Communications Act of 1934; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. RANKIN: A bill (H. R. 10308) for the erection of a public building at Macon, Noxubee County, Miss.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. DISNEY: A bill (H. R. 10309) to amend an act entitled "An act to authorize the Secretary of War to grant easements in and upon public military reservations and other lands under his control," approved May 17, 1926; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BUCK: A bill (H. R. 10310) to amend sections 210 (b) and 811 (b) of the Social Security Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BACON: A bill (H. R. 10311) to provide relief, work relief, and increase employment by grants to the States, Territories, and the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. PALMISANO (by request): A bill (H. R. 10312) to amend section 3 of the act entitled "An act to protect the lives and health and morals of women and minor workers in the District of Columbia, and to establish a Minimum Wage Board, and to define its powers and duties, and to provide for the fixing of minimum wages for such workers, and for other purposes," approved September 19, 1918 (65th Cong., 40 Stat. 960); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. BURDICK: A bill (H. R. 10313) authorizing payment to the Devils Lake Band of Sioux Indians, of the Devils Lake (N. Dak.) Indian Reservation, at the Fort Totten (N. Dak.) Indian Agency, for damages for wood and timber used and destroyed by the armies of the United States while maintaining a military post at Fort Totten, N. Dak., between the years 1867 and 1890, and for which damages the said Indians have not been heretofore compensated; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10314) authorizing payment to the Devils Lake Band of Sioux Indians of the Devils Lake (N. Dak.) Indian Reservation, at the Fort Totten (N. Dak.) Indian Agency, for 64,000 acres of land of which said band of Indians was deprived by the erroneous survey made by the United States Government under the treaty of February 19, 1887, between the Sisseton and Wahpeton Bands of Sioux Indians and the United States (15 Stat. L. 505), ratified April 15, 1867; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. BLAND: A bill (H. R. 10315) to amend the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, to further promote the merchant marine policy therein declared, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10316) to amend section 203 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. MAY (by request): A bill (H. R. 10317) to remove certain inequitable requirements for eligibility for detail as a member of the General Staff Corps; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SHAFER of Michigan: Resolution (H. Res. 466) requesting certain data on imports from the Department of Agriculture, the Department of Labor, the Department of the Interior, and the War Department; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

By Mr. BREWSTER: Joint resolution (H. J. Res 658) for the designation of a street or avenue to be known as "Maine Avenue"; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to enact House bill 9256, relative to reimbursement by the Federal Government to States and counties for expenditures in behalf of nonresidents; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to consider their Senate Joint Resolution No. 7, relative to necessary aids to night air navigation; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to consider their joint resolution No. 6, relative to Federal tax on oil; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to consider their joint resolution No. 5, with reference to flood relief; to the Committee on Flood Control.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to consider their joint resolution No. 15, relative to aliens in America; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Massachusetts, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to consider their resolution dated April 11, 1938, with reference to reciprocal-trade agreements; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BERNARD: A bill (H. R. 10318) for the relief of Itasca County Abstract Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. CARLSON: A bill (H. R. 10319) for the relief of Thomas J. Smith; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. CLARK of Idaho: A bill (H. R. 10320) directing the Secretary of the Interior to issue to Lester E. Joslin a

patent to certain lands in the State of Idaho; to the Committee on Patents.

By Mr. HARTLEY: A bill (H. R. 10321) for the relief of Capt. Malcolm K. Beyer; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. HAVENNER: A bill (H. R. 10322) for the relief of James William Cole; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. McCORMACK: A bill (H. R. 10323) for the relief of the Lamson Co., Inc.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. McLAUGHLIN: A bill (H. R. 10324) for the relief of Paul T. Sims; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MAGNUSON: A bill (H. R. 10325) for the relief of the estate of Alfred Batrack; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. RANDOLPH: A bill (H. R. 10326) to authorize and direct the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to set aside the trial-board conviction of Policeman David R. Thompson and Ralph S. Warner and their resultant dismissal and to reinstate David R. Thompson and Ralph S. Warner to their former positions as members of the Metropolitan Police Department; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. REED of New York: A bill (H. R. 10327) for the relief of A. S. Tait; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SMITH of Oklahoma: A bill (H. R. 10328) for the relief of S. A. Rourke; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. TAYLOR of Tennessee: A bill (H. R. 10329) for the relief of the New Amsterdam Casualty Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. VINSON of Georgia: A bill (H. R. 10330) to provide for the reimbursement of certain enlisted men of the Navy for the value of personal effects lost in a fire at the Naval Air Station, Hampton Roads, Va., May 15, 1936; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. ZIMMERMAN: A bill (H. R. 10331) for the relief of Otho L. Curtner; to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

4851. By Mr. BEITER: Petition of the Central Labor Council of Buffalo and vicinity, Buffalo, N. Y., urging appropriation of \$5,000,000,000 for Public Works Administration and Works Progress Administration, and advocating liberalization of Works Progress Administration rules governing eligibility of applicants for employment; to the Committee on Appropriations.

4852. Also, petition of the American Legion, New York County organization, urging establishment of post exchanges in Army encampments, bases, forts, and reservations so that enlisted men and officers may benefit, and advocating retention of all post exchanges without restriction; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

4853. By Mr. BIERMANN: Petition of Mrs. A. M. Avery and others, of Mason City, Iowa, asking for legislation stopping the advertising of alcoholic beverages by press and radio; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

4854. By Mr. BOYLAN of New York: Resolution adopted by the American Legion, New York, N. Y., favoring the retention of all post exchanges in Army encampments throughout the United States without restriction; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

4855. Also, resolution unanimously adopted by the executive committee of the New York Typographical Union, No. 6, representing more than 10,000 workers employed in the printing industry in Greater New York, calling for an investigation by Congress into the condition of the newspaper print stock used by publishers throughout the United States; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

4856. Also, resolution adopted by the members of the New York Board of Trade, New York, N. Y., opposing House bill 3134, placing a tax on fuel oil; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

4857. By Mr. COFFEE of Washington: Resolution of the Labor's Non-Partisan League of Wayne County, Mich., Alan

Strachan, secretary-treasurer, setting forth that the culture of our native land should march hand in hand with our economic program, and that the enlightening influence of the arts on our national character is a vital part of our democratic heritage and that encouragement of the arts has been sadly lacking in the United States heretofore, and therefore heartily endorsing the pending Coffee bill (H. R. 9102) for the establishment of a permanent Bureau of Fine Arts; to the Committee on Education.

4858. By Mr. CONNERY: Resolution of the Massachusetts State branch, American Federation of Teachers, recording uncompromising opposition to the so-called industrial mobilization bill; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

4859. Also, resolution of the Massachusetts State branch, American Federation of Teachers, recording its hearty support of the National Labor Relations Act; to the Committee on Labor.

4860. By Mr. CULLEN: Petition of the American Legion, New York County organization, urging the retention of all post exchanges without restriction; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

4861. By Mr. FLAHERTY: Petition of the United Office and Professional Workers of America, protesting against the passage of the May bill; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

4862. Also, petition of the United Office and Professional Workers of America, expressing its approval of the provisions of Senate bill 3390; to the Committee on Labor.

4863. By Mr. HAVENNER: Petition of the Senate of the State of California, memorializing the President and Congress of the United States concerning Senate Joint Resolution No. 7, relative to providing all necessary aids to night air navigation; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

4864. Also, petition of the Assembly of the State of California, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States concerning Assembly Joint Resolution No. 6, relative to Federal tax on oil; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

4865. Also, petition of the Assembly of the State of California, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States concerning Assembly Joint Resolution No. 15, relative to aliens in America; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

4866. Also, petition of the Assembly of the State of California, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States concerning Assembly Joint Resolution No. 5, relative to making Federal funds available for flood relief; to the Committee on Flood Control.

4867. Also, petition of the board of supervisors of the city and county of San Francisco, imploring the President of the United States and the Maritime Commission to withdraw their opposition to the McAdoo-Welch resolution and make every effort to retain at least the Panama-Pacific liners in their present essential intercoastal service; to the Committee of Foreign Affairs.

4868. Also, petition of the Senate of the State of California, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States concerning their Senate Joint Resolution No. 5, relative to reimbursement by the Federal Government to States and counties for expenditures in behalf of nonresidents; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

4869. By Mr. KENNEDY of New York: Petition of the New York Board of Trade, Inc., concerning Senate bill 3390, to extend the powers of the National Labor Relations Board; to the Committee on Labor.

4870. Also, petition of the New York Board of Trade, Inc., concerning House bill 3134, to impose a tax on fuel oil; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

4871. By Mr. KEOGH: Petition of the Central Civic Association of Hollis, Inc., Hollis, Long Island, N. Y., concerning the Barry bill (H. R. 2717); to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

4872. Also, petition of the Long Beach Municipal Band, Long Beach, Calif., concerning House bill 4947 and Senate bill 2369; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

4873. Also, petition of Peter J. Salmon, secretary and assistant director, the Industrial Home for the Blind, favoring the passage of Senate bill 2819 and companion bill introduced by Mrs. O'DAY, for the creation of a Committee on Purchases of Blind-made Products, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

4874. By Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts: Memorial of the General Court of Massachusetts, protesting against the inclusion of furniture and toys in any reciprocal-trade agreements; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

4875. By Mr. PFEIFER: Petition of the Navy Yard Local Union, No. 543, Brotherhood of Painters, Decorators, and Paperhangers of America, Brooklyn, N. Y., concerning the Federal Workers Minimum Wage Act of 1938 (H. R. 9158); to the Committee on Labor.

4876. Also, petition of the Industrial Home for the Blind, Brooklyn, N. Y., urging consideration of Senate bill 2819; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

4877. By Mr. PLUMLEY: Resolution of the Vermont Society of Engineers, protesting against the curtailment of the Federal-aid highway program; to the Committee on Roads.

4878. By Mr. QUINN: Resolutions of Local 610, United Electrical, Radio, and Machine Workers of America, Wilmerding, Pa., protesting against the May bill (H. R. 9604); to the Committee on Military Affairs.

4879. Also, resolutions of the Duplate Local, Federation of Flat Glass Workers, Creighton, Pa., on State and Federal work relief; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

4880. By Mr. RICH: Petition of citizens of Williamsport, Pa., protesting against the passage of the so-called anti-firearms bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

4881. By Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey: Petition signed by 270 residents of Sussex County, N. J., protesting against the National Firearms Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

4882. By the SPEAKER: Petition of veterans' nonpartisan clubs of the Twelfth District, Pomona, Calif., urging a congressional investigation of the trial and conviction of Congressman John H. Hoepfel; to the Committee on Rules.

4883. Also, petition of the Valley Cottage Regular Democratic Club of Rockland County, N. Y., petitioning consideration of their resolution dated April 12, 1938, with reference to Roosevelt haters; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

4884. Also, petition of the South Carolina Federation of Commerce, Agriculture, and Industry, Columbia, S. C., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to national economic problems; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

SENATE

WEDNESDAY, APRIL 20, 1938

The Chaplain, Rev. Z. Barney T. Phillips, D. D., offered the following prayer:

I am the resurrection and the life, saith the Lord: he that believeth in me, though he were dead, yet shall he live: and whosoever liveth and believeth in me shall never die.

Let us pray.

O Eternal God and Heavenly Father, whose mercies cannot be numbered, in whose presence there is the fullness of joy, and at whose right hand there is pleasure for evermore: draw us closer unto Thee and to each other as we pause to pay reverent tribute to the memory of our brother beloved whom we have loved long since and lost a while, whose conspicuous devotion to his country crowned his gifts of leadership, and whose loyalty to friends was as the armor of a knight dedicated to a divine adventure.

Help us, therefore, we beseech Thee, to learn to understand wisdom secretly, for Thou requirest truth in the inward parts, and grant us the spirit of humility, without which faith becomes presumption, hope delusion, and love weakness, that